DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 319 042 CS 212 326

AUTHOR Harrison, Robert L., Jr.
TITLE The Recurring Author: William Shakespeare, a Case Study through Content Analysis.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 151p.; Ph.D. Thesis, American University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Case Studies; *Content Analysis; *Curriculum Research; English Literature; Grade 9; Grade 10; Grade 12; High Schools; *Statistical Analysis; *Textbook Content; Textbook Research
IDENTIFIERS *Shakespeare (William)

ABSTRACT

The "recurring author" is one whose works appear many times at different levels in instructional units found in literature textbook series. A descriptive case study discussed the treatment of a recurring author, William Shakespeare, using units in a sample of six literature textbook series. Developed to describe, to code, and to analyze the content of the Shakespeare units, a content analysis instrument had a rated content validity of 91% and an interrater reliability of 92%. Using percentages to identify the occurrence of items appearing in Shakespeare units for grades 9, 10, and 12 in the textbook series, contents were described based on these percentages. It was also determined that the content of the Shakespeare units across grades 9, 10, and 12 differed statistically but not substantially in the degree of emphasis placed on four areas of content: biographical information, Shakespeare's works, Shakespeare's theater, and issues related to instruction as measured by the instrument. Findings suggest a need for further research in the areas of recurring authors, teaching Shakespeare, and restructuring of literature series textbooks. (Twelve tables of data are included. Appendixes include state student enrollment figures, the content analysis instrument, and a textbook analysis scoring sheet. A 152-item bibliography is attached.) (Author/SG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED319042

THE RECURRING AUTHOR: WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, A CASE STUDY THROUGH CONTENT ANALYSIS

by

Robert L. Harrison, Jr.

submitted to the

Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences

of The American University

in Partial Fulfillment of

The Requirements for the Degree

of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Educational Administration

Signatures of Committee:

Chair: [signature]

[signature]

[signature]

[signature]

[signature]

[signature]
Dean of the College

July 28, 1988
Date

CS 212 326

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ROBERT L. HARRISON, JR.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1988

The American University
Washington, D.C. 20016

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

© COPYRIGHT

BY

ROBERT L. HARRISON, JR.

1988

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE RECURRING AUTHOR: WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE,

A CASE STUDY THROUGH CONTENT ANALYSIS

by

Robert L. Harrison, Jr.

ABSTRACT

The recurring author is one whose works appear many times at different levels in instructional units found in literature textbook series. This study described the treatment of a recurring author, Shakespeare, using units in a sample of six literature textbook series student editions and teacher manuals for grades nine, ten, and twelve. The descriptive case study determined the content of the Shakespeare unit for each grade level in the sample and determined whether the content of the Shakespeare unit differed across grade levels in the sample.

The William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument was developed for this study to describe, to code, and to analyze the content of the Shakespeare units. The William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument had a rated content validity of 91 percent and an inter-rater reliability of 92 percent.

The study used percentages to describe the occurrence of items appearing in the Shakespeare units for grades nine, ten, and twelve in the six literature textbook series

examined. The content of the Shakespeare unit was described based on these percentages. The study also determined that the content of the Shakespeare units across grades nine, ten, and twelve differed statistically but not substantially in the degree of emphasis placed on four areas of content: biographical information, Shakespeare's works, Shakespeare's theater, and issues related to instruction as measured by the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument.

Recommendations for further study in the areas of recurring authors, teaching Shakespeare, and textbook evaluation criteria were given.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A content analysis is completed during an arbitrary time period (Krippendorf, 1980). This time period began in summer 1985 and ended in summer 1988. The researcher would like to acknowledge people who have influenced, shaped, and directed this study.

First, the dissertation committee, consisting of Dr. Lynn Z. Lang, chairperson, and members: Dr. Valerie French, Dr. L. Lee Knefelkamp, Dr. Jeanne A. Roberts, and Dr. Ramsay W. Selden, provided valuable assistance in all phases of this study.

Second, people who were involved in some aspects of the study included: Robin Carter, typist; Dr. Robert Morasky, dissertation seminar leader; Don Ekland, Association of American Publishers; The National Education Association's Instructional and Professional Services Division; panel of experts: Willie Dixon, Peggy O'Brien, Dr. Jeanne A. Roberts, and Jerry Shelton; content coders: Delores Bourne and Carol Mamone; and Carol Leary and Janet Jalloul, for their friendship. Also a special note of thanks goes to the following publishers: Amsco, Ginn, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Houghton Mifflin, Macmillan, McDougal-Littell, McGraw-Hill, and Scott Foresman.

On a personal note, the researcher acknowledges the

influence of his deceased parents Mr. and Mrs. Robert L. Harrison. He also acknowledges: Frances A. Harrison and Julia M. Harrison, his sisters, and Tom Harrison, his brother; Aunt Julia Matus who instilled in him the value of an education; and Doug and Delores Bourne. On a larger scale, he recognizes the encouragement, prayers, and support that he received from people in Bluefield, West Virginia and Washington, D.C.

Finally, he thanks God for a relationship that provided him with this experience, sustained him during this experience, and blessed him with the people mentioned above and others not mentioned who have also played a significant role in his life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ii

LIST OF TABLES ix

Chapter

I. THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING. 1

Introduction 1
The Recurring Author Defined 4
The Recurring Author: William Shakespeare 5
Textbooks in the Instructional Process . . . 6
Need for the Study 6
Research Questions 8
Definition of Terms 8
Limitations of the Study 11
Chapter Summary 12

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 14

Introduction 14
The Recurring Author 14
William Shakespeare as a Recurring Author . . 15
Teaching William Shakespeare in United States High Schools Today 17
Student Attitudes Toward the Study of William Shakespeare 18
The Case Study through Content Analysis . . . 19
Content Analysis in Exploratory Research . . 19
Content Analysis in the Research on Teaching Literature 20
Procedures in Content Analysis 20
The Textbook in Education 21
Factors Affecting Textbook Content 23
The Textbook Publishing Industry 25
The Textbook Selection Process 28
The Textbook Evaluation Process 29
Suggestions for Textbook Revision 32
The Textbook in the Literature Curriculum . . 33
The Evolution of Literature as a Curricular Offering 34
The Emergence of the Literature Anthology . 35
Chapter Summary 37

III. PROCEDURES 40

Introduction 40
The Sample 40
Critera for Determining the Sample 40
Procedures for Determining the Sample . . . 41
Insuring Objectivity in Identifying the Sample 43
Instrumentation 43
Procedures for Developing the William Shakespeare Content Analysis Instrument . 44
Establishing Content Validity of the William Shakespeare Content Analysis Instrument 45
Establishing Reliability of the William Shakespeare Content Analysis Instrument . 48
Collecting the Data 50
Analyzing the Data 53
Chapter Summary 55

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 56

Research Question 1 56
General Information 56
General Information Grade Nine 59
General Information Grade Ten 59
General Information Grade Twelve 60
Summary of General Information About the Shakespeare Unit 61
The Content of the Shakespeare Unit 63
Biographical Content 63
Shakespeare's Works 68
The Theater in Shakespeare's Time 72
Content Related to Instruction 76
Summary of Research Question 1 82
Research Question 2 84
Chi-Square Tables Discussed 84
Discussion of Research Question 2 95
Chapter Summary 96

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 97

Conclusions 97
Conclusion One 97
Conclusion Two 98
Recommendations 103
Recurring Authors 103
Teaching Shakespeare 104
Literature Textbook Evaluation Criteria . . 105
Closing Statement 106

APPENDIX

A. Student Enrollment for Grades Nine, Ten, and Twelve of the Member States of the National Association of State Textbook Administrators . . . 109

B. Vita 111

C. William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument 113

D. Textbook Analysis Unit (TAU) Coding Sheet 120

E. Marking and Coding Textbook Analysis Units (TAU's) Using a Researcher Written Textbook Passage for a Student Edition of a Literature Textbook Series Shakespeare Unit 123

F. Textbook Analysis Units (TAU) Coded and Percentage of Agreement Scores by the Two Textbook Coders . . 126

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 129

LIST OF TABLES

1. Formula for Reliability Based on a Percentage of Agreement Score 49
2. Summary of Percentage of Agreement Scores to Determine Reliability 50
3. General Information Reported as Averages of the Six Literature Textbook Series in the Sample for Grades Nine, Ten, and Twelve on Part I of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument 57
4. Biographical Content of the Shakespeare Unit for Grades Nine, Ten and Twelve on Part II of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument 64
5. Shakespeare's Work Content of the Shakespeare Unit for Grades Nine, Ten, and Twelve on Part II of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument 69
6. Theater in Shakespeare's Time Content of the Shakespeare Unit for Grades Nine, Ten, and Twelve on Part II of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument 73
7. Content Related to Instruction of the Shakespeare Unit for Grades Nine, Ten, and Twelve on Part II of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument 77
8. Frequencies and Percentages of Literature Textbook Series in Which Items on Part II of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument Occurred 3 Times or 50 Percent for Each Grade . . 83
9. Chi-Square Table of Textbook Analysis Units (TAU's) by Content Area on the WSCAI* and by Grade (N=1616) 85
10. Chi-Square Table of Textbook Analysis Units (TAU) for Grade Nine by Item and by Series (N=558) . . . 89
11. Chi-Square Table of Textbook Analysis Units (TAU) for Grade Ten by Item and by Series (N=511) . . . 92
12. Chi-Square Table of Textbook Analysis Units (TAU) for Grade Twelve by Item and by Series (N=547) . . 94

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

Introduction

Cultural literacy is shared knowledge that every American should know to be conversant in today's society (Hirsch, 1987). E.D. Hirsch, Jr. attempts to define cultural literacy in the form of a proposed list describing what every American should know in order to be culturally literate in the United States. Although Hirsch's work has implications for education, it did not define cultural literacy based on what was being currently taught in English classrooms in the public schools of the United States, on the content of literature curricula, or even on the content of literature textbook series.

On the other hand, the research of Diane Ravitch and Chester E. Finn, Jr., What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know? (Ravitch & Finn, 1987), attempts to measure the factual information in history and in literature that high school students know. This research concluded that high school students lack certain basic factual knowledge in history and literature upon which to build further knowledge.

In an effort to understand why students do not possess a background in factual information in history and

literature, Ravitch and Finn reviewed research in teaching for both fields. They found that the most recent research that defined the content of the literature curriculum for high school students appeared in the 1960's.

Two factors appear to account for this twenty year time lapse. First, the emphasis in the research in teaching English shifted from literature to composition in the 1970's. This emphasis was seen in a content analysis of 176 research articles written during the last two decades. This analysis showed that fifty-one articles (29 percent) were devoted to composition, while only twenty-seven of them (15 percent) were devoted to literature (O'Donnell, 1981); the remaining ninety-eight studies (56 percent) were devoted to other aspects of English curriculum. Second, since the 1960's, the professional consensus of educators that supported the established literature curriculum had dissolved as a result of criticism from many special interest groups: criticism from minorities because minorities were ignored; criticism from feminists because women writers were ignored; criticism from those who believed that students would prefer literature with content that was relevant to their own lives; and criticism from those who, on principle, were opposed to the very idea of a standard literature curriculum for high school.

The work of Hirsch (1987) and Ravitch and Finn (1987) has heightened the potential for research on

teaching literature. Where should research in teaching literature begin?

A reasonable focal point for such a research effort could be an examination of how literature educators have defined the literature curriculum for high school students. Once an understanding of the curriculum has been established, an attempt can be made to update and to revise the content of the literature curriculum for high school students.

In Literature and the Reader, Alan C. Purves and Richard Beach (1972) reviewed the research in teaching literature that had been done prior to 1970. Purves and Beach found that Edna Hayes (1936) had compiled a list of authors and titles in order of their first appearance on college entrance requirement lists from 1870-1900. The purpose of Hayes' work was to document the content of the literature curriculum on the assumption that a standardization of authors and their works would help high school students prepare for college entrance exams by having a list of commonly occurring authors that students should study prior to taking their entrance examinations for colleges.

Purves and Beach (1972) cited the work of two additional studies, Anderson (1948) and Olson (1969), who examined tables of contents of samples of high school literature textbook series over several years in order to

develop a list of commonly taught authors and their works. Anderson's and Olson's lists were compiled and subsequently formed the basis for further research in the content of the literature curriculum as well as for literature textbook content revision (Purves & Beach, 1972).

Once Anderson's and Olson's lists were compiled, no further research was done, and the data they collected did not become the basis for more research. It was obvious that further exploratory research was needed to describe how the authors and their works that appeared on these lists were treated by and were presented to students in current literature textbook series, since literature textbooks have been shown to be excellent indicators of instruction (Wenger, 1986). Such exploratory research might reveal what is typically taught about specific authors, their lives, their works, and how those authors influenced other writers and their works. Also, such research might provide a basis for specifying at which grade level students might begin studying certain authors, what works might best represent authors to students, and what teaching methods might be used to present these authors. The present research was designed to achieve these purposes.

The Recurring Author Defined

In the spirit of Hirsch's notion of cultural literacy, it is affirmed that some authors or works are likely

to be taught regularly in literature courses. A recurring author is one whose works appear many times and at different grade levels in instructional units found in literature textbook series. The term is used as an organizing term around which the present study was designed.

The Recurring Author: William Shakespeare

William Shakespeare is considered by many the greatest playwright who ever lived (Chute, 1979).

> No dramatist, living or dead, has been more frequently reprinted or performed, or translated into a greater variety of languages. A collected edition of Shakespeare is usually the first choice, along with the Bible, of anyone asked to plan one's reading matter in the event of shipwreck on a desert island (Schoenbaum, 1979).

Furthermore, reading lists for high school students cited in Purves and Beach's (1972) work showed that Shakespeare and his works appeared more frequently on reading lists than did any other authors and their works.

Even though Shakespeare's popularity has been well established by scholars and by educators (Evans, 1966 and Edens, 1977), an organized body of research in teaching Shakespeare is minimal; it includes one historical study (Simon, 1932), two descriptive studies (Bohn, 1955, and Niles, 1970), two experimental studies (Slayton, 1969 and Porreca-Easley, 1987) and one case study (Brichto, 1977). The lack of research in teaching Shakespeare can be linked to the lack of research in teaching literature in general, as seen in the overemphasis on research in composition in

the 1970's (O'Donnell, 1981) and in pressures from special interest groups (Ravitch & Finn, 1987).

Textbooks in the Instructional Process

Textbooks are used by 43 million children in the public school systems of the United States (Keith, 1981). The impact of textbooks on the total educational system and, therefore, on the quality of educational outcomes cannot be underestimated (Keith, 1981). This impact is further emphasized by the fact that the classroom textbook is often the only resource on a given subject to which students will be exposed during their educational careers. According to one estimate, 95 percent of a student's classroom time and 90 percent of a student's homework time is spent with textbook materials (Cole, 1981).

Moreover, textbooks shape and direct the content and methods of classroom presentations made by many teachers (Keith, 1981). Hence, the teacher manual of the literature textbook series may be the primary source material consulted when making instructional decisions. In short, literature textbook series student editions and teacher manuals play a major role in every student's education.

Need for the Study

Despite the proliferation of research demonstrating that William Shakespeare is a case study example of a recurring author (cultural literacy lists, college prepara-

tory reading lists, and tables of contents of literature textbook series), little is known about what is taught in Shakespeare units in American high schools. In fact, there is no evidence of any current research that describes the content of the Shakespeare units in the high school, especially as this content appears in literature textbooks. In addition, no current research appears to have investigated whether Shakespeare units differ in any systematic or desirable manner from grade to grade or publisher to publisher in the high school literature program, and, if so, how. Therefore, this study was needed to examine and to describe the William Shakespeare unit in literature textbooks and, in so doing, to provide a basis for suggesting revisions in literature textbook series Shakespeare units and for designing further exploratory research into specific methodologies that are appropriate for teaching Shakespeare.

Finally, by using William Shakespeare as a case study of a recurring author, this study also was needed to establish a basis for other case studies on how a variety of other recurring authors are treated in literature textbook series. When eventually linked together, these case studies might form the basis for an evolving literature curriculum that would be responsive to the needs of high school students in a changing, diverse society (Apple, 1986). They also would have the potential for input to the

literature textbook evaluation and revision process. This study was designed to describe the content of the William Shakespeare units in selected, currently used literature textbook series and to determine whether William Shakespeare units in those textbooks differed in content across the grades.

Research Questions

1. What is the content of the William Shakespeare unit in a sample of six literature textbook series for grades nine, ten, and twelve, as measured by the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument?

2. Does the content of the William Shakespeare unit in literature textbook series for grades nine, ten, and twelve differ among the three grade levels examined in this study, and does the content differ among literature textbook series in any given grade?

Definition of Terms

Biographical information is content that provides the student and the teacher with knowledge about Shakespeare's life.

Captions are content appearing under illustrations to explain the illustration.

Case study is an investigator's detailed examination of a single subject (Borg, 1983).

Coding units are the smallest segments of content

counted and scored in content analysis (Budd, Thorp, & Donohew, 1967).

Content analysis is a research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication (Berelson, 1952).

Context units are the bodies of material surrounding the coding unit in content analysis (Budd, Thorp, & Donohew, 1967).

Explanatory information is any information in the literature textbook series clarifying the text of the play or the plot of the play.

Format is the arrangement of the content and illustrations in student editions and teacher manuals of the literature textbook series.

Illustrations are charts, maps, portraits, diagrams, drawings, or photographs related to the literature textbook series Shakespeare unit.

Literature textbook adoption periods are the five-year time periods in which literature textbook series are used by local school systems in a state.

Non-dramatic Shakespearean literature is the poems, sonnets, and songs of William Shakespeare.

Public school systems are defined as local, city, county, and state education agencies funded from governmental sources.

A recurring author is one whose works appear many

times and at different grade levels in instructional units in literature textbook series.

A school textbook is a book that is used in a public school system to provide a basis for instruction in an academic area such as English, math, or science.

A school literature textbook series is a coordinated group of student editions and teacher manuals of textbooks that are designed by a publisher for use in teaching literature courses.

Sequencing describes the amount of and distribution of the content of the Shakespeare unit. Excluded from the definition are issues such as cognitive, moral, or psychological development of the learner.

A Shakespeare unit is defined as a unit in a literature textbook series that treats Shakespeare as a dramatist. For purposes of this study, the Shakespeare unit consisted of five topics: general information, biographical information about Shakespeare, Shakespeare's works, Shakespeare's theater, and instructional issues related to studying Shakespeare.

A student edition of a school literature textbook series is an edition that is either issued or sold to a student.

A teacher manual of a school literature textbook series is a manual available only to the teacher for instructional use.

Textbook Analysis Unit (TAU) refers to the set of words in the prose text of the literature textbook series student edition and teacher manual required to cover one specific item on the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument.

Textual abridgement is any attempt to shorten the text of a Shakespearean play. For purposes of this study, textual abridgement was considered in relation to specific content that addressed this subject in either the teacher manuals or the student editions of the literature textbook series that were included in the sample.

Limitations of the Study

1. This study was limited to an analysis of six literature textbook series that appeared a minimum of sixteen times or 80 percent on literature textbook adoption lists for twenty states during the adoption period of 1983-1988. Therefore, the results of this study concerning content of the Shakespeare unit were only generalizable to those states and/or to those school systems that used the particular literature textbook series included in the sample during the time period specified.

2. The study examined only high school literature textbook series for grades nine, ten, and twelve where Shakespearean drama was primarily taught. Grade eleven was excluded from the study because American literature is usually taught at this grade level.

3. William Shakespeare units in literature textbooks that dealt with non-dramatic Shakespearean literature were not included in this study.

4. The analysis of literature textbook series was limited to those series made available by publishers who furnished complimentary copies of their literature textbooks during the time frame of this study.

5. Paperback editions of William Shakespeare's plays were excluded from analysis.

6. Literature textbook series without a teacher manual accompanying the student editions were excluded from analysis.

7. Sequencing was limited to the amount of and distribution of the content of the Shakespeare unit.

Chapter Summary

This study developed and described the concept of the recurring author, William Shakespeare, and its potential analysis at three grade levels in the content of a sample of literature textbook series adopted from 1983-1988. Shakespeare was chosen as the focus of examination in literature textbooks because information about his life and his works occupy a significant percentage of the content of current literature textbook series and because the notion of cultural literacy affirms the validity of attention to some authors and their works.

The present study was motivated by a lack of a

systematized body of research in the literature on recurring authors, in general, and on the teaching of Shakespeare, in particular. A second motivating assumption was that the content of the Shakespeare unit could be determined by describing the content of literature textbook series Shakespeare units in student editions and in teacher manuals based on the belief that textbooks were indicative of the content of the literature curriculum in public schools of the 1980's.

Finally, this study collected data that had implications for textbook revision and for literature textbook evaluation. It also established a basis for further research in teaching Shakespeare and suggested a structure for examining other recurring authors in literature textbook series.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This review of the literature is divided into four parts: a discussion of the recurring author, a discussion of William Shakespeare as an example of a recurring author, a discussion of case study through content analysis methodology, and a discussion of the role of the textbook in education.

The Recurring Author

No evidence of the definition of a recurring author was apparent in the literature studies that have classified works commonly taught in high school (Anderson 1948 and Olson 1969). In An Analysis of Textbooks in Relation to Declining SAT Scores (1977), Jean S. Chall analyzed literature textbook series at the eleventh grade level from 1949 to 1968. One finding of her study was that authors included in eleventh grade literature textbook series varied only slightly in the literature textbook series she examined over the nineteen year period. This finding lent support to the view that English educators and publishers tend to recognize certain authors as being more important or valuable for study than others, and that tables of

contents of literature textbooks might be good indicators of who those recurring authors are.

William Shakespeare as a Recurring Author

William Shakespeare is considered the author most widely read by students in United States high schools (Hayes, 1936; Anderson, 1948; Olson, 1969). From the appearance of the first student edition of Julius Caesar by William Rolfe in 1869 to the current estimate that 76 percent of all high school students will have read Macbeth before they graduate (Purves & Beach, 1972), the works of William Shakespeare have been a high priority in the literature curriculum.

In her work, College Entrance Requirements in English: Their Effects on the High School, Edna Hayes (1936) compiled a list of authors and titles in the order of their first appearance on the College Entrance Requirements list from 1870-1900. Of the ninety-one works on Hayes' list, fifteen were devoted to Shakespeare. Works by Shakespeare on the list included: 1874 - The Tempest, Julius Caesar, The Merchant of Venice; 1878 - Macbeth, Coriolanus, As You Like It; 1879 - Richard II, A Midsummer Night's Dream; 1880 - King Lear, Much Ado About Nothing; 1881 - Romeo and Juliet, Hamlet; 1882 - Othello, King John; and 1893 - Twelfth Night (Applebee, 1974).

Anderson (1948) wanted to determine what major works were commonly taught in high school literature classes.

He found that no one work was universally taught; but that Macbeth was taught 76 percent of the time followed by Hamlet, taught 75 percent of the time (Purvis & Beach, 1972).

James Olson's The Nature of Literature Anthologies Used in Teaching of High School English 1917 - 1957 (1969) defined quantitatively the content of literature textbook anthologies. He divided his study into three historical periods 1917 - 1934; 1935 - 1945; and 1946 - 1957, and discussed them as significant evolutionary periods in the role of the literature anthology. Shakespeare's Macbeth was the first of the longer literary works to be included in a literature anthology during the period 1917 - 1934 according to the research done by Olson. Black (1967) found evidence that as early as the 1920's Macbeth had been the only Shakespearean play to appear consistently in hardbound English anthologies used by students in high school (Black, 1967).

William J. Bennett, as director of the National Endowment for the Humanities, invited several hundred educational and cultural leaders to recommend ten books that any high school graduate should read. Bennett also invited the general public through George F. Will's syndicated newspaper column to submit a similar list. Bennett received responses from 500 individuals who listed hundreds of different texts and authors. The Bible, four

Shakespeare plays and American historical documents were cited at least 50 percent of the time on these 500 lists (Bennett, 1984).

Teaching William Shakespeare in United States High Schools Today

Units on teaching William Shakespeare appear virtually unchanged from William Rolfe's student edition of Julius Caesar in 1869. William Shakespeare units in high school English classes in the United States contain certain common topics. Students are introduced to the study of the play, the history of the play, the sources of the plot, the play itself, and notes related to the study of the play. These appear to be common topics in the William Shakespeare unit (Bohm, 1955; Veidemanis, 1964; Slayton, 1969; and Niles, 1970). William Rolfe's student edition of Julius Caesar in 1869 contained these same topics, leading one to question whether the structure of the content of the Shakespeare unit has changed substantially in a little over a century. There is no evidence of research about how long a teacher should spend on teaching the Shakespeare unit in the classroom (Niles, 1970). Grade level appropriateness for teaching certain plays was suggested by Evans (1966), but these conclusions were not supported by specific research. Further, no research appears to investigate whether Shakespeare units are sequenced in their content from grade nine to grade ten to grade twelve when

Shakespeare units are normally taught (Evans, 1966). Audio-visual aids such as video-cassettes and recordings of the plays have been the single most innovative change in how Shakespeare units are taught in high schools today (Porreca-Easley, 1987).

Student Attitudes Toward the Study of William Shakespeare

Although the study of drama as a literary form is the most popular genre in students' literary preferences for in class study (Purves & Beach, 1972), student attitudes toward the study of Shakespeare remain negative (Bohn, 1955; Veidemanis, 1964; Slayton, 1969; and Niles, 1970). Seven factors were cited by Veidemanis (1964) as contributing to negative student attitudes.

1. Too much time spent on history and art projects; too little concentrated attention on the written text itself.

2. Overexhaustive study of a single play - bleeding it dry.

3. Too much attention to footnotes, criticism, emendation to the extent that the play becomes burdened beyond the difficulties it already presents.

4. Too much "rapture" or virtuousness surrounding the venture on the part of the teacher - the feeling that "at last, we are on something really worthwhile, and even though it is painful, it is good for you!"

5. Too much teacher reading and explication with too little endeavor to teach students to read and comprehend Shakespeare for themselves.

6. Too much popularizing or trying to make Shakespeare easy.

7. Pushing Shakespeare on students who are too immature to handle him.

The Case Study Through Content Analysis

To be able to describe the content of the Shakespeare unit in high school literature textbook series, it is necessary to examine briefly the appropriate methodology in the field of educational research. First, exploratory research is defined as research in an area where basic research knowledge has not been established. Based on exploratory research, other researchers can design research projects that will subsequently form the body of research in a given field (Kerlinger, 1973). Second, the case study is an investigator's detailed examination of a single subject (Borg, 1983). Third, content analysis is a research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication (Berelson, 1952).

Content Analysis in Exploratory Research

Most content analysis in educational research has been aimed at answering questions directly relating to descriptions of the material analyzed. For example, a content analysis of textbooks can tell the researcher what topics are covered by all books, what emphasis is placed on each topic, and in what sequence topics are usually presented.

Content analysis relies heavily on using frequency

counts to answer research questions. It can be a valuable tool for obtaining certain types of information (Borg, 1983), particularly information that is exploratory in nature such as the descriptive study of the recurring author William Shakespeare proposed in this study.

Content Analysis in the Research on Teaching Literature

Content analysis has been used in answering research questions about the teaching of literature. Kaiser (1976) determined the percentage of content in eighth grade literature textbooks that dealt with work and attitudes toward work in order to examine the possibilities for an integrated career education program. Last (1978) described complaints filed in relation to three major literature textbook series proposed for adoption in Texas in 1978. Hart (1979) determined the content of secondary English instructional materials produced by Project English Centers. Walker (1982) determined the portrayal of Blacks, Mexican Americans, and Indians in the content of selected Texas-adopted secondary American literature textbooks. These studies used content analysis to answer their research questions.

Procedures in Content Analysis

A good content analysis is rarely ever finished. It will answer some questions; it will pose new questions.

Content analysis is conducted within an arbitrary period of time when a researcher begins a study and when a researcher finishes a study. Every content analysis follows certain procedures (Krippendorf, 1980). First, a sample must be selected, such as a literature textbook series. Second, an instrument must be developed to measure in a quantifiable method the sample in the study. Third, systematic procedures for data collection and data analysis must be established. Fourth, revisions in the procedures, the sample, or the data analysis must be made as the study evolves (Budd, Thorp & Donohew 1967; Holsti, 1969; and Krippendorf, 1980).

The Textbook in Education

Legitimate knowledge in public schools by and large is made available through something to which educators have paid far too little attention - the textbook. Whether educators like it or not, the curriculum in most American schools is not defined in courses of study or suggested programs, but by one particular artifact, the standardized, grade-level-specific text (Walker & Soltis, 1986). For instance, during their school careers, children will commit to memory or will absorb at least 32,000 textbook pages (Black, 1967).

Frequently, the classroom textbook is the only resource on a given subject to which students will be exposed during their educational careers (Cronbach, 1955;

and Goldstein, 1978). In some subjects, the textbook is the whole curriculum. For other subjects, the textbook, the teacher edition, and the workbook are the "curricular hub," establishing a content area expertise that the teacher may not possess, organizing some content around some topic in a logical manner, providing sequencing within the textbook, and providing tests for evaluation of the knowledge acquired by students (Wenger, 1986). For the English teacher, the textbook may be the only source consulted in teaching a given unit (Wolfe, 1986). For the student, the textbook is the ultimate authority on matters of dispute (Wenger, 1986).

According to one estimate, 95 percent of classroom instruction and 90 percent of homework time of the children of this nation are structured by textbook materials. These findings were reported by Shirley A. Jackson, Acting Director of the Right to Read Program for the U.S. Office of Education at a conference entitled, "The Role of the Textbook in American Society," held at the Library of Congress in 1981 (Cole, 1981). Earlier, Goldstein (1978) reported that 75 percent of classroom instruction and 90 percent of homework assignments were based on the school textbook. In either case, the impact of textbooks on the total educational system and on the quality of educational outcomes is very high.

School textbooks have been the focus of educational

research. To understand these areas of research and to understand the framework of this study, it is necessary to examine the textbook content, the textbook publishing industry, the textbook selection process, the textbook evaluation process, and the suggestions for textbook reform.

Factors Affecting Textbook Content

In Text Materials in Modern Education, Lee J. Cronbach attempted to define what constituted a textbook (Cronbach, 1955). He defined four principles that should control the selective organization of subject matter into a textbook. (1) The materials must hang together in some way; coherence is usually achieved in terms of an organized discipline. (2) Not all the information in any one discipline can be presented in a text. Therefore, the writer should seek to incorporate the essentials; that is, to define basic concepts, statements, principles, and to explain and illustrate their application. (3) The text is usually written for immature learners. Therefore, the discipline must be simplified to whatever degree fits the intended learner, and it is understood that texts written for more advanced learners will later present the same discipline with more precision. This implies that the text could be different in presenting material at each grade level of a textbook series. (4) Typically, the text is organized as a course of study so that chapters are to be

studied in sequence. Later chapters presuppose an acquaintance with earlier chapters (Cronbach, 1955). Cronbach's work is considered by textbook researchers as a paradigm of what constitutes a good textbook (Thompson, 1982).

On the subject of sequencing in textbooks, Andrew C. Porter has undertaken further research. In a presentation entitled, "Can a Book Be the Curriculum" (Cody, 1986), Porter stated at any given grade level, different textbooks in a series share about 50 percent of the content covered. Therefore, repetition of textbook content can be assumed within a textbook series and across a textbook series (Cody, 1986).

Another factor affecting textbook content is the dignity of the human person. The dignity of the human person has become an issue in the last twenty years in textbook content (Apple, 1986). A number of major organizations are now taking the position that textbook content should be free of bias based on gender (National Council of Teachers of English Policy Statement, 1978), race (The Council on Interracial Books for Children, 1979), and ethnic background (United States Commission on Civil Rights, 1980).

Research studies show that progress has been made in guarding against bias in textbook content. For example, Walker (1982) found that Blacks, Mexican Americans, and

Indians received more positive portrayal in current literature textbook series than in previous literature textbook series. Charles (1986) also found that American Indian literature had received more coverage in eleventh grade American literature anthologies in light of the recommendations made by the United States Commission on Civil rights (1980) and in comparison with previous literature anthologies.

A final factor affecting textbook content is the format. The textbooks that contain "pretty pictures," "heaps" of seatwork, and "easy to read" manuals are the ones most likely to be adopted by teachers (Graham, 1978, and Bernstein, 1985), thus illustrating how powerful text format can be in determining textbook selection.

The Textbook Publishing Industry

The entire textbook publishing industry with its 65,000 or so employees would rank nearly forty to fifty positions below other American companies based on sales. While the industry's total sales in 1980 were approximately six billion dollars, in many ways, its market is much less certain and is subject to greater economic, political and ideological contingencies than is the case for the larger companies (Apple, 1986).

Of the 6 billion dollars in total sales, 1.5 billion dollars comes from the elementary, secondary (or El-hi market as it is called), and the college text market; 1.2

billion dollars is accounted for by the sale of reference books, encyclopedias, and professional books; 1 billion dollars is taken in from book clubs and direct mail sales; books intended for purchase by the general public (trade books) have a sales level of 1 billion dollars; and nearly 660 million dollars in sales is accounted for by mass market paperbacks (Apple, 1986). Proportionally, the textbook market is no small segment of the total book publishing industry.

With successful marketing as a primary motivator, the textbook publisher's goal is to prepare a textbook that will be acceptable to a significant percentage of the 1.5 billion dollar market, and, hence, that will stimulate increased sales (De Silva, 1986). There are three stages in the textbook preparation process. The first stage is the analysis of the market for which the textbook is written. The second stage is the planning and preparation of the textbook, and the last stage is the marketing and promotional stage (Keith, 1981).

Analysis of the market, the first step in the process, is critical in the preparation of a school textbook. Publishers need to be aware of curricular demands and trends. In these demands, they also must be aware of curricular objectives of the school districts and of state school systems to which they anticipate marketing their textbooks. The textbooks that sell meet curricular

objectives of many markets. This supports the assumption that textbooks may be indicators of classroom instruction, and it is the source of the accusation that textbook content is broad and thin, covering all of the objectives to some degree but only a few in any depth (Tyson-Bernstein, 1988).

After the data about the market is assembled, the actual preparation of the textbook begins. The publisher contracts with two or more leading authorities in the field, usually a subject matter expert and an educator. Also, there may be a number of specialists who are contracted to write special elements such as teacher manuals, workbooks, and tests.

Once the manuscript of the textbook is completed, it is then submitted to the publisher's editors who edit. The manuscript is edited for several factors: its reading level, its emphasis on different aspects of content, its stand on controversial issues, and its adequacy in meeting special legal requirements such as non-discriminatory representation of women, men, and various ethnic groups (Keith, 1981). Because of this extensive editing, the textbook may become superficial in content. Mentioning is the term coined by Delores Durkin at the University of Illinois to describe this superficial content (Tyson-Bernstein, 1988). Textbook publishers are so eager to meet all market demands that textbooks hurry from topic to

topic; thus, mentioning results (Tyson-Bernstein, 1988).

Once the textbook is published, the marketing stage begins. This is the most critical stage from the publisher's perspective. Marketing tactics include the distribution of books to key educators in the field; the display of books at resource centers, book fairs, and teacher conventions; and the attempt to manage state and local adoption procedures for textbooks (Keith, 1981). Therefore, personable salespeople, promotional parties, free materials, and "best deals" influence buying decisions (Wenger, 1986).

The Textbook Selection Process

There are no federal regulations or specifications regarding what a state is to teach or is not to teach in public school curricula. Nor are there federal guidelines for the way in which educational materials used in public schools should be selected. Since this is the case, each state defines how it will select instructional materials (N.E.A., 1981). Specifically, it is the state department of education that has the authority to define policy with regard to choice of instructional materials, and this is either exercised by the state or delegated to local school districts.

There are two methods of textbook and instructional materials selection/adoption used in the United States. The first method is state adoption. The second method is local adoption (Muther, 1985).

State adoption involves the state department of education in selecting the textbooks for review by the local districts within the entire state. The following states use state adoption methods: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, and West Virginia (Muther, 1985 and Duke, 1987).

Local adoption is defined as local school district autonomy in selecting textbooks that meet the needs of the school district without interference from the state except on possible funding and purchasing issues. The following states use local adoption methods: Alaska, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming (Muther, 1986 and Duke, 1987).

The Textbook Evaluation Process

No matter what method of textbook selection a school system uses, all follow certain steps in the textbook evaluation process.

The first step in the textbook evaluation process is establishing the timetable according to which subject area

textbooks will be adopted. Subject area textbooks are typically adopted for a period of five to seven years (Wenger, 1986). Because the textbook evaluation process usually involves large numbers of personnel for long periods of time, school systems may stagger subject area adoptions. For example, one year English textbooks will be selected; another year science textbooks will be chosen. This cycle continues until all curricular areas have completed textbook evaluations during the five to seven years of the textbook adoption cycle (Oliphant, 1987). Literature textbooks are normally chosen on a five year cycle.

Within the yearly cycle of the textbook evaluation process, the curricular area textbook evaluation committee members must also establish a schedule. The average length of time spent on the adoption of a curricular area textbook ranges from two to twelve months (Duke, 1987). The thoroughness with which members of the textbook evaluation committee complete this evaluation process is determined by the time allocated to this task. Members of the textbook evaluation committee are usually full time employees of the school system, who, in addition to doing their normal assignments, must also take on the additional responsibility of textbook evaluation.

Also, textbook publishers do not always furnish enough copies of textbooks for use by all of the evaluation committee members. Therefore, the thoroughness with which

the members of the committee complete their evaluations may also be based directly on the amount of time committee members have the actual textbooks under consideration in their possession.

The second step involved in the textbook evaluation process involves forming a textbook adoption committee. This adoption committee includes a designated chairperson for the textbook evaluation process. This person, usually the school system specialist in the curricular area in which the textbooks are being considered for adoption, often designates department chairpersons of the various local schools in the district as the second members of the textbook evaluation committee. The third members of the committee in the process are the classroom teachers. Because of this hierarchial structure, the teacher of a given subject matter at a specific grade level may only evaluate the single textbook for that grade level (DeSilva, 1986). For example, English teachers evaluating literature textbooks may only evaluate the textbooks that directly apply to their teaching assignments: the ninth grade teacher may evaluate only ninth grade textbooks; the tenth grade teacher may evaluate only tenth grade textbooks; and the twelfth grade teacher may evaluate only twelfth grade textbooks. Seldom do textbook evaluation committee members evaluate all the textbooks in a textbook series under consideration (Cody, 1986). This segmentation on the part

of committee members will likely restrict the thoroughness of the overall evaluation that can be given to every book in a textbook series under consideration.

Next, textbook evaluation committee members review the textbooks under consideration with the aid of some form of textbook evaluation instrument. This is the third step in the process. In some cases, the textbook evaluation instrument is general and applicable to all textbooks in all subject areas. In other cases, the textbook evaluation instrument is highly specific to the subject matter area under consideration. Whether general or highly specific, flaws exist in reviewing textbooks using conventional textbook evaluation instruments (Tyson-Bernstein, 1988). Also, committee members are not properly trained in textbook evaluation procedures (Eash, 1986).

The last step in the textbook evaluation process is the approval of the final textbook selections and the implementation of adoption decisions. When textbook evaluation committee members complete their textbook evaluations, the system-wide results of these evaluations are compiled and followed by the approval of the final textbook selections and the purchasing of the adopted textbooks. Usually, the texts that receive the highest ratings on the evaluation forms are the ones that the district adopts (N.E.A., 1981).

Suggestions for Textbook Revision

The National Association of State Boards of Education

issued A Policy Maker's Guide to Textbook Selection (Cody, 1986). In this document four recommendations were made to textbook publishers: (1) Efforts to produce text that models the highest quality of writing and that is responsive to research in the fields of reading and instructional design should be increased. (2) Quality control mechanisms should be developed that ensure the integration of text content and style, graphics and instructional design of text and anciliary materials. (3) When original sources are expurgated or adapted, this should be acknowledged. (4) More sophisticated and accurate methods for developing text at various levels of difficulty should be developed.

In the area of textbook reform, Cronbach (1955) and Apple (1986) both suggested that the biggest responsibility for change falls on the classroom teacher. For example: (1) Teachers should demand better textbooks by refusing to adopt textbook series that do not meet their classroom needs. (2) Teachers should demand textbooks evaluation criteria from their administrators that reflect their classroom needs. (3) Teachers should demand staff development and training to help them become more sophisticated consumers of textbooks (Apple, 1986).

The Textbook in the Literature Curriculum

To understand the role of the textbook in the literature curriculum, a brief history of literature as a curricular offering is necessary. Next a description of the

kinds and types of literature textbooks will be given.

The Evolution of Literature as a Curricular Offering

The evolution of literature as a curricular offering began in the 1870's. Until that time the forerunners of the literature curriculum were the McGuffey Readers in the 1830's, the offering of the history of literature in the 1840's, and the creation of extracurricular discussion groups in the 1850's (Applebee, 1974).

William Holmes McGuffey developed a series of six readers intended to foster patriotism and to advocate a stern Protestant ethic through the writings of a wide variety of American and European authors. The books were graded by level of difficulty with selections of "real literary value" predominating in the last two readers in the series, reader 5 and reader 6. Applebee explained "real literary value" as literary works by noted authors. The inclusion of selections of literary value were limited to short selections of two pages at most. And finally, the teaching materials accompanying the selections placed strong emphasis on the mechanics of reading aloud, presenting such topics as "Articulation," "Inflection," "Accent," "Emphasis," "Modulation," and "Poetic Pause" (Applebee, 1974).

In the 1840's, literary history began its emergence as a result of a curricular trend toward the study of all

aspects of historical and biographical study. Two books, Thomas Budge Shaw's Outlines of English Literature published in 1848 and Charles D. Cleveland's History of English Literature in 1849, shaped the literary history curriculum. Through these works, students studied the history of literature in England and the biographies of noted English writers (Applebee, 1974).

From 1850-1870, the study of actual works of literature was limited to extracurricular discussion groups. Students interested in reading works by various authors would meet after school to discuss particular works (Applebee, 1974).

However, in the 1870's Harvard University significantly influenced the addition of literature to the English curriculum. Admission to Harvard was based on passing an entrance examination. To assist students seeking admission, the university prepared a reading list from which the exam would be developed and students soon realized their responsibility for reading certain works as a part of preparing to be examined. Therefore, public school systems had to teach the works that appeared on the reading list in order to provide that preparation for taking the examination and, by extension, for securing college admission (Applebee, 1974).

The Emergence of the Literature Anthology

The first literature anthology could be considered

the last two books of the McGuffey Reader series devoted to American and European authors. However, the first true literature textbook was William Rolfe's 1869 student edition of Julius Caesar by William Shakespeare. Rolfe prepared this work as an American version of Craik's edition of Julius Caesar. The student edition contained an introduction, the history of the play, the sources of the plot, critical comments on the play (26 pages), the play itself (102 pages), notes (82 pages), and an index of words and phrases explained (Rolfe, 1869). These student editions were used in extracurricular literature discussion groups. However, when literature became a part of the public school curriculum in response to the Harvard entrance exam, then student editions were widely used throughout school systems until the 1920's.

The Harvard reading list along with other college and university reading lists and entrance exams led to the creation of the College Board. The progressive emphasis on wider reading made the emergence of the literature anthology a natural occurrence. The literature anthology was an economical way of offering many literary experiences close together, according to Walter Barnes, the twenty-first president of National Council of Teachers of English. Critics of the anthology claimed that it was too broad in scope to give students any meaningful content. They believed that the anthology would never replace the student edition of

an actual literary work on a reading list (Applebee, 1974).

Over the next forty years from 1920 to 1960, the literature anthology continued to evolve in content and format and eventually became the literature textbook series. This evolution meant that one publisher's anthologies could be used for all grades in a given school from as early as the seventh grade until the twelfth grade.

In the 1960's, public school systems were required to absorb more of the costs of instructional materials (Gardner, 1978). Therefore, it became more cost effective to purchase a literature textbook series for an entire school system. With the production of low cost paperback textbooks, student editions of particular literary works could be purchased to supplement the literature anthology or the literature textbook series (Applebee, 1974). In this way, the literature anthology or the literature textbook series became the primary source of instruction, and the student annotated editions of specific literary works became supplemental sources of instruction. In other words, a complete reversal of the 1920's situation occurred forty years later.

Chapter Summary

This review of the literature has examined four major concepts: the concept of recurring author, William Shakespeare, as a recurring author, content analysis, and textbooks.

The concept of the recurring author has a research basis in the literature. William Shakespeare and his works are cited frequently on cultural literacy lists, on required reading lists, and in literature textbook series.

Throughout the development of the literature curriculum, and the development of the literature textbook, William Shakespeare as an author has been included. Although William Shakespeare's popularity with the general public is well established, student attitudes toward the study of Shakespeare remain negative. Units on William Shakespeare appeared to have remain unchanged from William Rolfe's student edition of Julius Caesar in 1869.

Content analysis has been used as a methodology in conducting research about teaching literature. Content analysis can be used in this study to define the term recurring author through a descriptive, case study to determine the content of Shakespeare units in currently used literature textbooks.

The review of the literature on textbooks was divided into six sections. Section one examined the content of the textbook as defined by Cronbach (1955), Porter (1986), and special interest groups such as the National Council of Teachers of English. Section two examined how textbooks are published. One unique problem of textbook publishing is that of "mentioning" that causes textbook content to become heavily laden with factual information. Section

three examined textbook selection critera. While the process of textbook adoption varies from state to state, two types of textbook adoption exist, state adoption and local adoption. Section four examined the textbook evaluation process. Seldom are total textbook series evaluated by all textbook evaluation committee members. Issues of content and sequencing are often neglected in the process. Section five discussed some suggestions for textbook reform. Reform is likely to occur when educators and publishers work together. Suggestions for educators and publishers were presented. To conclude the chapter, a brief history of the literature textbook series was given.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Introduction

This study was designed to describe the content of the William Shakespeare unit in a selection of current literature textbook series student editions and teacher manuals and to determine whether the content of the unit differed across grades nine, ten, and twelve.

Chapter III reviews the procedures used to carry out the study. First, the nature of the sample is discussed. Second, the development of the instrument used to code and to analyze the sample is described. Third, data collection procedures are reviewed. Fourth, data analysis procedures are explained.

The Sample

Criteria for Determining the Sample

The sample in this study was a selection of six literature textbooks series that specifically met all of the following criteria: (1) the literature textbook series included a Shakespeare unit in the ninth, tenth, and twelfth grade student editions; (2) the Shakespeare unit included a Shakespearean drama as a part of the unit in grades nine, ten, and twelve; (3) the literature textbook

series was written for average and above average students as determined in a phone interview with state textbook administrators of the respective states where the series had been adopted; (4) the literature textbook series appeared a minimum of sixteen times or 80 percent on state literature textbook adoption lists of states that were members of the National Association of State Textbook Administrators as of November 1987 and that adopted literature textbook series on a statewide basis for grades nine, ten, and twelve; and (5) the literature textbook series publisher was willing to furnish complimentary copies of the student editions and teacher manuals for grades nine, ten, and twelve to be analyzed during the time frame of the study.

Procedures for Determining the Sample

As a first step, a representative of the School Textbook Division of the Association of American Publishers first generated a list of literature textbook series publishers used in secondary schools in the United States. The representative also provided a list of states that were members of the National Association of State Textbook Administrators (see Appendix A).

Letters were then written to the publishers of those literature textbook series named on the list generated by the representative of the Association of American Publishers. In the letter to the publishers, the purpose of the study was explained and a request for complimentary copies

of the student edition and teacher manual of the literature textbook series for grades nine, ten, and twelve was made. Publishers who furnished complimentary copies of their literature textbook series received the results of this research. In all, ten letters were written to textbook publishers; eight publishers responded. Of the eight respondees, six literature textbook series met all the criteria established for the sample and subsequently became the sample.

Next, the researcher conducted phone interviews with each state textbook adoption administrator named on the National Association of State Textbook Administrators list (Appendix A). The purpose of the interviews was to determine whether or not each of the literature textbook series in the sample appeared a minimum of sixteen times or 80 percent on these states' respective literature textbook series adoption lists, and to ascertain the enrollment figures of these states for grades nine, ten, and twelve.

The final sample consisted of six literature textbook series used in grades nine, ten, and twelve for the state literature textbook adoption period of 1983-1988. Three literature textbook student editions and three teacher manuals were the components of each of the six literature textbook series yielding thirty-six context items for the total sample. Based on the enrollment figures gathered, the sample could be described as serving a potential

student population of 3,730,653 students, of which 1,377,273 were students in grade nine; 1,283,780 students in grade ten; and 1,069,600 students in grade twelve. (See Appendix A for a breakdown of the student population).

Insuring Objectivity in Identifying the Sample

To insure that the focus of all phases of the study remained on the content of the Shakespeare unit and not on publishers' names and/or reputations, random procedures were used to assign anonymous identification codes for each literature textbook series that was included in the sample. (Literature textbook series were coded as Series 1, Series 2, Series 3, Series 4, Series 5 and Series 6. This coding system was known only by the researcher before, during, and after data collection.)

Instrumentation

The instrument used to generate data was the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument, developed specifically for this study. The instrument was designed to measure the content of the Shakespeare unit in each literature textbook series in the sample by developing a checklist of minimal factual information that every student who studies Shakespeare might know after completing a textbook series' Shakespeare unit.

Procedures for Developing the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument

Based on the review of the literature (Cronbach, 1955; Evans, 1966; Chute, 1979; Muir & Shoenbaum, 1984; and Apple, 1986) and on the researcher's experience as an English educator (Appendix B), an initial list of over three hundred content items was generated to provide a basis for developing the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument. Each item on the initial list was classified by two questions: 1) in which of five categories of the new instrument should the item be found?, and 2) what was the importance or unimportance of the item in relation to general knowledge about Shakespeare that students might know after completing the Shakespeare unit in the literature textbook series?

The five categories used in answering the first question as it applied to each item on the intial list were drawn from the literature (Rolfe, 1869; Hudson, 1872; Simon, 1932; Evans, 1966; Niles, 1970; and Evans, 1977) and included: (1) general information about the textbook series, (2) biographical information about Shakespeare's life and times, (3) Shakespeare's works, (4) Shakespeare's theater, and (5) instructional issues related to the study of Shakespeare.

Answering these two questions about each of the three hundred items in the initial list resulted in a first draft

of the content analysis instrument. Items that were unimportant, redundant, or unrelated to the five categories of Shakespeare information were eliminated based on the opinion of the researcher. If any of these eliminated items appeared in the literature textbook series in the sample, they were treated in a third division of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument (see Appendix C). The resulting first draft of the instrument contained one hundred items.

Establishing Content Validity of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument

To determine the content validity of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument, opinions of a panel of experts were sought. The panel of experts consisted of four members. Expert I was a literature professor at a university in the District of Columbia who was recognized as a Shakespearean studies scholar. This expert was the president of the American Shakespeare Society in 1987. Expert II was a language arts supervisor for a school district located in the metropolitan area surrounding Washington, D.C. This expert had served in all aspects of literature textbook adoption and literature curriculum development committees. Expert III was an English teacher in a school district located in the metropolitan area surrounding Washington, D.C. This expert had participated in the Folger Shakespeare Library's Teaching

Shakespeare Institute in 1985 and had also served on literature textbook adoption committees. Expert IV was the Public Programs Director for the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, D.C. This expert was responsible for organizing the Teaching Shakespeare Institute sponsored by the Folger Shakespeare Library and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Each member of the panel of experts met separately with the researcher on one occasion to evaluate the content of the instrument. A common agenda was followed at each separate panel member meeting including: 1) discussing the purpose of the study; and 2) allowing the panel member to read, respond to, comment on, question, and disagree with items on or excluded from the first draft of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument.

As the panel member read, responded to, questioned or disagreed with the items on the content analysis instrument, the researcher recorded his or her comments. Comments that were considered disagreements with items on the William Shakespeare Content Analysis Instrument received a value of one point and were subtracted from one hundred (the total number of items on the instrument). Determining content validity of the instrument was based on a modification of the percentage of agreement score (Holsti, 1969; and Krippendorf, 1980). Items that ultimately remained on the William Shakespeare Content Analysis Instrument were

those items on which all three panel members agreed with the researcher, thus establishing a content validity.

Expert I disagreed with ten items on the first draft of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument for a percentage of agreement score of 90 percent. Expert II disagreed with eight items of the first draft of the instrument for a percentage of agreement of 92 percent. Expert III disagreed with nine items on the instrument for a percentage of agreement score of 91 percent. Disagreements on the items on the instrument by all panel members were on the wording of the item and not the content of the item. The average percentage of agreement score that resulted from the three individual panel of expert meetings was 91 percent. Based on the recommendations of the panel of experts, the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument was then revised.

The final revised draft was submitted to Expert IV. After reading this revised copy of the instrument (Appendix C), this expert also agreed that the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument had the content validity necessary to collect data that would be meaningful to answering the research questions of this study. Her percentage of agreement score with the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument was 100 percent.

Establishing Reliability of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument

For purposes of this study, reliability was defined as the ability of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument to yield data consistently a minimum of 85 percent of the time when used to analyze literature textbook series content for grades nine, ten, and twelve using a percentage of agreement score (Fox, 1969).

A reliability study was conducted in November 1987 to determine the reliability of the instrument for yielding data. The study involved a meeting of two content coders and the researcher. Both the content coders and the researcher were English teachers in Bluefield, West Virginia who had a minimum of ten years of teaching experience and who had taught Shakespeare units that included Romeo and Juliet, Julius Caesar, Macbeth, and Hamlet.

Literature textbook Series 1 was chosen arbitrarily as the basis for determining instrument reliability since it was the first series whose publisher made copies of student editions and teacher manuals for grades nine, ten, and twelve available for analysis.

At the meeting with the content coders, an explanation of the purpose of the study was given. The content coders then read a copy of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument. Once they completed reading the instrument, they were asked to code the Shakespeare

unit for grade nine using the William Shakespeare Content Analysis Instrument. After the content coders and the researcher read and coded the student edition and the teacher manual of Literature Textbook Series 1, a percentage of agreement score was calculated to determine reliability between Coder I, Coder II, and the researcher in order to determine whether the William Shakespeare Unit Instrument yielded reliable data. On that basis, reliability of the instrument was inferred (Holsti, 1969). Table 1 presents the formula that was used to determine reliability based on a percentage of agreement score.

TABLE 1

FORMULA FOR RELIABILITY BASED ON A PERCENTAGE OF AGREEMENT SCORE

$$\text{Percentage of Agreement} = 100 \times \frac{\text{number of content items coded identically}}{\text{total units of content coded}}$$

The average percentage of agreement scores for all three combinations of the content coders was 92.3 percent for the grade nine student edition and teacher manual for Literature Textbook Series 1, exceeding the 85 percent level. The content coders also coded Literature Textbook Series 1 for grade ten and grade twelve following the same

coding procedures used for grade nine. Table 2 summarizes the data on which overall reliability of 91.7 percent for the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument was determined, taking all three grade levels into consideration.

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF PERCENTAGE OF AGREEMENT SCORES TO DETERMINE RELIABILITY

	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11
Rater I and Rater II	91	93	90
Rater III and the Researcher	91	91	92
Rater II And the Researcher	95	93	90
Average	92.3%	92.3%	90.6%
Overall Average 91.7%			

Collecting the Data

Data for this study were located in two distinct units, the context unit and the coding unit.

The context unit was the body of material surrounding the coding unit (Budd, Thorp, & Donohew, 1967). Context units for this study were the William Shakespeare units for grades nine, ten, and twelve found in the student editions and teacher manuals for each of the six literature textbook

series included in the sample. Thirty-six context units were analyzed in this study.

A coding unit is defined as the smallest segment of content counted and scored in content analysis (Budd, Thorp & Donohew, 1967). The coding unit for this study was the Textbook Analysis Unit (TAU), a term unique to this study and based on the Basic Space Unit (Budd, Thorp & Donohew, 1967), designed to describe the number of words in the prose text of the literature textbook series student edition and teacher manual that were required to cover one specific item on the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument. TAU's were marked by the researcher in the context units for this study. Captions under illustrations in the unit were excluded in identifying TAU's. Also excluded from TAU identification was the text of the play that was included in the Shakespeare unit. (See Appendices D and E for sample marking and coding of TAU's in the context units.)

Prior to collecting the data, all TAU's for every student edition and teacher manual in the sample were marked and numbered, and data collection sheets were printed. The data collection coders coded a total of 1616 TAU's.

The data collection coders were the same two people who coded Literature Textbook Series 1 during the reliability study of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis

Instrument. The researcher marked but did not code the TAU's in this study.

Prior to the actual data collection, a training session was held in March 1988 to update the data collection coders with the new developments in content coding procedures that had evolved since the reliability study in November 1987. The important difference in the content coding procedures, since reliability determination had been done, was the use of the Textbook Analysis Unit (TAU). The Textbook Analysis Unit was explained and demonstrated to the two content coders using Literature Textbook Series 4 student edition and teacher manual. The two content coders used the William Shakespeare Content Analysis Instrument (Appendix C) and the data collection sheets (Appendix D) to practice coding TAU's for Literature Textbook Series 4 at the ninth grade level.

Once they coded the grade nine student edition and teacher manual, a percentage of agreement score was calculated in order to establish reliability between the two data collection coders who were using the Textbook Analysis Units (TAU's) to collect data for the first time. The percentage established to determine reliability of independent coding was 85 percent. The percentage of agreement score between the two coders was calculated at 92.45 percent for the entire sample thus establishing reliability of content coding (Appendix F).

Data collection coders met to reconcile the data on the TAU items on which they disagreed. All of the TAU codings reported in Chapter IV are reconciled codings. To reconcile the data, the content coders reached an agreement on their codings for the items on which they disagreed.

The two data collection coders continued to collect data for grades ten and twelve following the same procedures as outlined for grade nine. All calculations of percentage of agreement scores for content coding appear in Appendix F. Data collection began and ended in March 1988.

Analyzing the Data

Analysis of data was divided into three steps. Step I analyzed Part I of the William Shakespeare Content Analysis Instrument that dealt with the category of general information found in the content of the literature textbook series Shakespeare units. General information included textbook series, format of the series, and a basic description of format. No statistical test was used to analyze these data.

Step II was devoted to describing the content of the Shakespeare unit. This description was based on frequency of occurrence of items on the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument. For an item to be reported as appearing in the Shakespeare unit for a particular grade, it had to appear a minimum of three times or 50 percent in each of the six literature textbook series in the sample.

This descriptive information answered research question 1 about the description of the content of the Shakespeare unit for grades nine, ten, and twelve.

Step III dealt with analyzing the information from Part II of the instrument in order to answer research question 2 that dealt with the description of the content of the William Shakespeare Unit at each of three grade levels (nine, ten, and twelve) in a selection of literature textbook series.

Description of content focused on the four major content areas of a Shakespeare unit: Biographical information, Shakespeare's works, Shakespeare's theater, and instructional issues related to the study of Shakespeare. A 3 x 4 chi-square table was constructed for the total TAU's for all three grades for all six series, and for all of the four major content areas in order to answer research question 2. Then, a 4 x 6 chi-square table for grades nine, ten, and twelve was constructed. The 4 x 6 chi-square table represented the four areas of content of the Shakespeare Unit and the six textbook series used in the sample at the three grade levels of literature textbook series included in the sample.

These tables were used to support the hypothesis implicit in research question 2 that no significant difference existed in Shakespeare units in literature textbook series written for grades nine, ten, and twelve. A level

of significance of less than .05 was set to support the hypothesis implicit in research question 2.

Chapter Summary

This chapter explained the procedures used by this researcher to conduct the study. First, the researcher determined a sample of the textbook series. Second, the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument was developed, validated, and tested for reliability. Procedures relating to data collection constituted the third part of this chapter. Analyzing the data was the final consideration of this chapter. These procedures were undertaken to describe the content of the William Shakespeare unit in a sample of current literature textbook series and to determine if a significant difference was noted in the content of the Shakespeare unit for grades nine, ten, and twelve.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results of the study. The appropriate data collected specifically to answer these questions are presented, and the implications of the data are discussed.

Research Question 1

What is the content of the William Shakespeare Unit as evidenced in a sample of six literature textbook series for grades nine, ten, and twelve as measured by the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument?

General Information

To answer research question 1, the data collected from Section I, II, and III of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis is presented in Tables 3-8. Section I of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument covered general information about the literature textbook series. This general information is outlined here as an introduction to the description of the content of the Shakespeare Unit for grades nine, ten, and twelve. A summary of data gathered by the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument relating to the category of general information is found in Table 3.

TABLE 3

GENERAL INFORMATION REPORTED AS AVERAGES OF THE SIX LITERATURE TEXTBOOK SERIES IN THE SAMPLE FOR GRADES NINE, TEN, AND TWELVE ON PART I OF THE WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE UNIT CONTENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT

Item	Averages			
	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 12	Average (N=18)
Range of number of pages in student edition	(86-110)	(86-103)	(73-96)	(73-110)
Mean number of pages in student edition	100	99	83	94
Range of number of pages in teacher manual	(12-20)	(8-20)	(8-18)	(8-20)
Mean number of pages in teacher manual	17	16	14	16
Percentage of unit content in student edition	64%	72%	78%	71%
Percentage of unit content in teacher manual	36%	28%	22%	29%
Title of drama	Romeo & Juliet	Julius Caesar	Macbeth	Not Applicable
Type of drama	Tragedy	Tragedy	Tragedy	Not Applicable
Number of series in which abridgement mentioned	4	1	3	8
Percentage of series in which abridgement mentioned	67%	16%	50%	44%

TABLE 3
(Continued)

GENERAL INFORMATION REPORTED AS AVERAGES OF THE SIX LITERATURE TEXTBOOK SERIES IN THE SAMPLE FOR GRADES NINE, TEN AND TWELVE ON PART I OF THE WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE UNIT CONTENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT

Item	Averages			
	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 12	Average (N=18)
Format of the text of the play in the student edition	67%NS* 33%NB**	67%NS 33%NB	67%NS 33%NB	67%NS 33%NB
Range of numbers of illustrations	(11-28)	(12-36)	(7-18)	(7-36)
Average number of illustrations	17	16	12	15
Bibliography and audio visual resources included	100%	100%	100%	100%

*NS = Explanatory notes in the margin of the text of the play

**NB = Explanatory notes at the bottom of the text of the play

General Information Grade Nine

To summarize from the basic data derived from Section I of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument found in Table 3, the Shakespeare unit for the ninth grade featured the tragedy Romeo and Juliet in all six series. An average of one hundred pages (range 86-110 pages) of the literature textbook series student edition for grade nine was devoted to the Shakespeare unit; and an average of seventeen pages (range 12-20 pages) comprised the teacher manual for the unit. The student edition of the literature textbook series contained 64 percent of the units' contents while 36 percent of the content was found in the teacher manual for the literature textbook series.

The average number of illustrations incorporated in the unit was seventeen (range 11-28 illustrations). Explanatory information was located in the margins of the text of the play in two-thirds of the series in the sample while one third of the time this explanatory information was found at the bottom of the page of the text of the play. All literature textbook series for grade nine included bibliographic and audio visual information. In two thirds of the series, the teacher manual mentioned that Romeo and Juliet was abridged.

General Information Grade Ten

The Shakespeare unit for grade ten featured the tragedy Julius Caesar in all six textbook series. An

average of ninety-nine pages (range 86-103 pages) of the six literature textbook series in the sample were devoted to the Shakespeare unit; an average of seventeen pages (range 8-20 pages) comprised the teacher manual for this unit. The student edition of the Shakespeare unit contained 72 percent of the content; 28 percent of the content of the unit was found in the teacher manual.

An average of sixteen illustrations (range 12-36 illustrations) were incorporated into the format of the student edition of the six literature textbook series. Explanatory information related to the text of the play was placed in the margin of the text of the play in two-thirds of the series; one-third of the time this explanatory information was found at the bottom of the page of the text of the play. All literature textbook series for grade ten included bibliographic and audio visual information. In one of the series, the teacher manual mentioned that Juluis Caesar was abridged.

General Information Grade Twelve

The Shakespeare unit for grade twelve featured the tragedy Macbeth in all of the series; however, Hamlet was an option available in one literature textbook series. This option did not alter the general information pertaining to the content of the Shakespeare unit for grade twelve. An average of eighty-three pages (range 73-96 pages) of the six literature textbook series in the sample were devoted

to the Shakespeare unit; and an average of fourteen pages (range 8-18 pages) comprised the teacher's manual for this unit. The student edition of the textbook contained 78 percent of the unit's content while 28 percent of the content of the unit was found in the teacher's manual.

An average of twelve illustrations (range 7-18 illustrations) were incorporated into the format of the student edition of the literature textbooks series. Explanatory information related to the text of the play was located 67 percent of the time in the margin of the text while 33 percent of the time the explanatory material information was placed at the bottom of the text of the play. All literature textbook series for grade twelve included bibliographic and audio-visual information. In half of the series, the teacher manual mentioned that Macbeth was abridged.

Summary of General Information About the Shakespeare Unit

Data about the general information found in the Shakespeare unit showed that the average number of pages devoted to the Shakespeare unit in the literature textbook series student edition for grade nine was one hundred pages; for grade ten, ninety-nine pages; and for grade twelve, eighty-three pages for an average of ninety-four pages. The teacher manual for grade nine consisted of seventeen pages; for grade ten, sixteen pages; and for grade twelve,

fourteen pages for an overall average of sixteen pages. The data further showed that the greater percentage of the content of the Shakespeare unit for grades nine, ten, and twelve was found in the student edition with an average percentage of the total content being 71 percent as compared with an average percentage of the total content being 29 percent in the teacher's manuals.

An average of fifteen illustrations were used in all the Shakespeare units. Abridgement of the drama included in the Shakespeare unit was only reported in the teacher manual 44 percent of the time according to the data. Explanatory information to clarify the plot of the play was presented 67 percent of the time as marginal notes, beside the text of the play; whereas, 33 percent of the time this explanatory information was found below the text of the play. Bibliographic and audio-visual information was included in all six of the literature textbook series student editions or teacher manuals.

Shakespearean tragedy was the major content emphasis of all three grade levels in all six literature textbook series in the sample. Romeo and Juliet, a tragedy, was included in grade nine. Julius Caesar, a tragedy, was included in grade ten. Macbeth or Hamlet, both tragedies, was included in grade twelve. No literature textbook series offered a Shakespearean comedy, history, or romance

as an option for the tragedies found in grades nine, ten, or twelve.

Content of the Shakespeare Unit

Section II of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument categorized the content of the Shakespeare Unit. This content was divided into four areas: biographical information, Shakespeare's works, the theater in Shakespeare's time, and issues related to instruction. Frequency counts of occurrence or non-occurrence of items on the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument in the literature textbook series in the sample for grades nine, ten, and twelve are reported as frequencies and percentages in Tables 4-7. Only items on the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument that occurred 3 times or 50 percent in the six literature textbook series for each grade are reported in the discussion of content of the Shakespeare Unit.

Biographical Content

Table 4 presents a comparison of the biographical content of the Shakespeare unit for grades nine, ten, and twelve. There were twenty-eight items on the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis pertaining to biographical items.

In the ninth grade, basic biographical information about William Shakespeare included: that he was born in

TABLE 4

BIOGRAPHICAL CONTENT OF THE SHAKESPEARE UNIT FOR GRADES NINE, TEN, AND TWELVE ON PART II OF THE WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE UNIT CONTENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT

Item	Frequency of and Percentage of Series in Which Item Occurred							
	Grade Nine (N=6)		Grade Ten (N=6)		Grade Twelve (N=6)		Average (N=18)	
	F*	%**	F	%	F	%	F	%
101 Place of birth	5	83%	4	67%	6	100%	15	83%
102 Date of birth	4	67%	4	67%	5	83%	13	72%
103 Baptismal date	1	17%	1	17%	2	33%	4	22%
104 Father's name	0	0%	5	83%	3	50%	8	44%
105 Mother's name	0	0%	3	50%	3	50%	6	33%
106 The Shakespeare Coat of Arms	1	17%	0	0%	2	33%	3	17%
107 Shakespeare's education	4	67%	3	50%	6	100%	13	72%
108 Shakespeare's marriage date	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%
109 Age at marriage	4	67%	4	67%	4	67%	12	67%
110 Wife's name	5	83%	6	100%	6	100%	17	94%
111 Wife's age at marriage	2	33%	3	50%	4	67%	9	50%
112 First child's name	0	0%	3	50%	5	83%	8	44%

*Frequency of occurrence of an item

**Percentage of occurrence of an item

TABLE 4
(CONTINUED)

BIOGRAPHICAL CONTENT OF THE SHAKESPEARE UNIT FOR GRADES NINE, TEN, AND TWELVE ON PART II OF THE WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE UNIT CONTENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT

Item	Frequency of and Percentage of Series in Which Item Occurred							
	Grade Nine (N=6)		Grade Ten (N=6)		Grade Twelve (N=6)		Average (N=18)	
	F*	%**	F	%	F	%	F	%
113 First child's date of birth	0	0%	2	33%	2	33%	4	22%
114 Birth of twins	1	17%	3	50%	1	17%	5	28%
115 Twin's names	0	0%	3	50%	5	83%	8	44%
116 Twin's date of birth	0	0%	1	17%	1	17%	2	11%
117 1585-1592, "Dark Years" or "Lost Years"	1	17%	4	67%	6	100%	11	61%
118 Shakespeare's membership in Chamberlain's Men Theatrical Company	3	50%	6	100%	6	100%	15	83%
119 Shakespeare's membership in King's Men's Theatrical Company	3	50%	3	50%	6	100%	12	67%

*Frequency of occurrence of an item

**Percentage of occurrence of an item

TABLE 4
(CONTINUED)

BIOGRAPHICAL CONTENT OF THE SHAKESPEARE UNIT FOR GRADES NINE, TEN, AND TWELVE ON PART II OF THE WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE UNIT CONTENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT

Item	Frequency of and Percentage of Series in Which Item Occurred							
	Grade Nine (N=6)		Grade Ten (N=6)		Grade Twelve (N=6)		Average (N=18)	
	F*	%**	F	%	F	%	F	%
120 Explanation of a theatrical company	0	0%	2	33%	0	0%	2	11%
121 Shakespeare's financial success in the theater	2	33%	3	50%	6	100%	11	61%
122 Retirement to Stratford-upon-Avon	3	50%	3	50%	2	33%	8	44%
123 Retirement year	1	17%	2	33%	3	50%	6	33%
124 Date of death	4	67%	5	83%	6	100%	15	83%
125 Age at death	0	0%	2	33%	1	17%	3	17%
126 Will	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
127 Place of burial	1	17%	0	0%	3	50%	4	22%
128 Tombstone inscription	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	1	6%

*Frequency of occurrence of an item

**Percentage of occurrence of an item

Stratford-upon-Avon on April 23, 1564, that he had a grammar school education, that, at age eighteen, he married Anne Hathaway, that he was a member of Lord Chamberlain's Men Theatrical Company and later, King's Men Theatrical Company, and that he retired to Stratford-upon-Avon where he died on April 23, 1616.

To this basic ninth grade biographical information that is repeated in grade ten, the following additional biographical information included the fact that William Shakespeare's father's name was John Shakespeare, that his mother's name was Mary Arden Shakespeare, that Anne Hathaway was twenty-six years old when she married William Shakespeare, and that a daughter Susanna and twins Hamnet and Judith were born during their marriage. Also, included was information that little was known of Shakespeare's life between 1585 and 1592. These years were called the "Dark Years" or "Lost Years," and that Shakespeare became wealthy as a dramatist before he retired.

In the twelfth grade, the biographical information presented in the ninth grade and tenth grade was repeated. Two new facts were added at the twelth grade that he retired in 1610 before his death in 1616, and that he was buried in Holy Trinity Church in Stratford-upon-Avon.

Additional biographical items appearing in fewer than half of the series were his baptismal date, the Shakespeare coat of arms, the marriage date, the first child's date of

birth, an explanation of a theatrical company, Shakespeare's age at death, and information about his will and his tombstone inscription.

Shakespeare's Works

Table 5 presents the content of the Shakespeare Unit for grades nine, ten, and twelve pertaining to Shakespeare's works. There were twenty-four items on the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument pertaining to Shakespeare's works.

The fact that the plots for Shakespeare's thirty-seven plays are adapted from other sources was established in the ninth grade content of the literature textbook series included in the sample. In the tenth grade, information that Shakespeare was a dramatist who wrote tragedies and comedies was added to the information presented in grade nine. (A title of one tragedy and one comedy were given to support this statement.) In the twelfth grade, the additional content about his works included: Shakespeare wrote "Venus and Adonis," "The Rape of Lucrece," and 154 sonnets. Also presented were the facts that he wrote history plays and that his works were first published in the First Folio in 1623.

Information about Shakespeare's works that appeared less than 50 percent of the time data included: descriptions of Shakespeare as a narrative poet, examples of Shakespearean drama that were romances, and the fact

TABLE 5

SHAKESPEARE'S WORKS CONTENT OF THE SHAKESPEARE UNIT FOR GRADES NINE, TEN, AND TWELVE ON PART II OF THE WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE UNIT CONTENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT

Item	Frequency of and Percentage of Series in Which Item Occurred							
	Grade Nine (N=6)		Grade Ten (N=6)		Grade Twelve (N=6)		Average (N=18)	
	F*	%**	F	%	F	%	F	%
201 Shakespeare as dramatist	2	33%	3	50%	5	83%	10	55%
202 Shakespeare as narrative poet	0	0%	2	33%	1	17%	3	17%
203 "Venus and Adonis"	0	0%	0	0%	3	50%	3	17%
204 "The Rape of Lucrece"	0	0%	0	0%	3	50%	3	17%
205 Sonnets	0	0%	2	33%	6	100%	18	44%
206 Source materials for plays	6	100%	6	100%	6	100%	6	100%
207 Number of Shakespeare's plays	4	67%	3	50%	5	83%	12	67%
208 Definition of Quarto edition	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
209 Publication of Quarto edition	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%

*Frequency of occurrence of an item

**Percentage of occurrence of an item

TABLE 5

(CONTINUED)

SHAKESPEARE'S WORKS CONTENT OF THE SHAKESPEARE UNIT FOR GRADES NINE, TEN, AND TWELVE ON PART II OF THE WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE UNIT CONTENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT

Item	Frequency of and Percentage of Series in Which Item Occurred							
	Grade Nine (N=6)		Grade Ten (N=6)		Grade Twelve (N=6)		Average (N=18)	
	F*	%**	F	%	F	%	F	%
210 Definition of Folio edition	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
211 Explanation of First Folio	0	0%	1	17%	3	50%	4	22%
212 John Heminge and Henry Codell, compilers of First Folio	0	0%	2	33%	2	33%	4	22%
213 Publication date of the First Folio	0	0%	1	17%	3	50%	4	22%
214 Second Folio	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
215 Third Folio	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
216 Fourth Folio	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
217 Shakespearean comedies	1	17%	3	50%	4	67%	8	44%
218 Title of one comedy	1	17%	3	50%	3	50%	7	39%

*Frequency of occurrence of an item

**Percentage of occurrence of an item

TABLE 5

(CONTINUED)

SHAKESPEARE'S WORKS CONTENT OF THE SHAKESPEARE UNIT FOR GRADES NINE, TEN, AND TWELVE ON PART II OF THE WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE UNIT CONTENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT

Item	Frequency of and Percentage of Series in Which Item Occurred							
	Grade Nine (N=6)		Grade Ten (N=6)		Grade Twelve (N=6)		Average (N=18)	
	F*	%**	F	%	F	%	F	%
219 Shakespearen tragedies	1	17%	4	67%	5	83%	10	55%
220 Title of one tragedy	1	17%	3	50%	4	67%	8	44%
221 Shakespearen history play	1	17%	2	33%	4	67%	7	39%
222 Title of One History Play	1	17%	1	17%	3	50%	5	28%
223 Shakespearen romances	0	0%	0	0%	2	33%	2	11%
224 Title of one romance	0	0%	1	17%	2	33%	3	17%

*Frequency of occurrence of an item

**Percentage of occurrence of an item

that his plays were published as quarto editions or folio editions. Neither definitions nor descriptions of quarto or folio editions were given, nor was information that John Heminge and Henry Condell were the compilers of the First Folio.

The Theater in Shakespeare's Time

Table 6 presents the content of the Shakespeare Unit for grades nine, ten, and twelve related to the theater in Shakespeare's time. There was a possibility of twenty-one items on the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument pertaining to the theater in Shakespeare's time.

Shakespeare wrote during the Elizabethan Age. His plays were written for the Globe Theater whose parts were described or illustrated in all three of the Shakespeare units for all six series in grades nine, ten, and twelve in the sample. Content on the theater in Shakespeare's time also included that some members of the audiences attending the plays were called "groundlings," that plays were performed in the afternoon and involved a minimal use of scenery and props, that special effects were attempted to maintain audience interest, that acting as a career was difficult, and that women did not act in the dramas.

The term "Renaissance" was introduced as part of the content for grade ten to describe the era when Shakespeare wrote. Also, added for grade ten was information that the cost of admission to the plays was relatively low and that

TABLE 6

THEATER IN SHAKESPEARE'S TIME CONTENT OF THE SHAKESPEARE UNIT FOR GRADES NINE, TEN, AND TWELVE ON PART II OF THE WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE UNIT CONTENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT

Item	Frequency of and Percentage of Series in Which Item Occurred							
	Grade Nine (N=6)		Grade Ten (N=6)		Grade Twelve (N=6)		Average (N=18)	
	F*	%**	F	%	F	%	F	%
301 Plays produced during the Elizabethan Age	3	50%	4	67%	3	50%	10	56%
302 Plays produced during the Renaissance	0	0%	3	50%	1	17%	4	22%
303 Audience description	6	100%	4	67%	4	67%	14	78%
304 Cost of admission to a play	1	17%	3	50%	5	83%	9	50%
305 Groundling defined	4	67%	1	17%	0	0%	5	28%
306 Globe Theater	6	100%	6	100%	6	100%	18	100%
307 Parts of the Globe Theater described or illustrated	6	100%	6	100%	6	100%	18	100%
308 Time of day of plays	3	50%	4	67%	2	33%	9	50%

*Frequency of occurrence of an item

**Percentage of occurrence of an item

TABLE 6

(CONTINUED)

THEATER IN SHAKESPEARE'S TIME CONTENT OF THE SHAKESPEARE UNIT FOR GRADES NINE, TEN, AND TWELVE ON PART II OF THE WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE UNIT CONTENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT

Item	Frequency of and Percentage of Series in Which Item Occurred							
	Grade Nine (N=6)		Grade Ten (N=6)		Grade Twelve (N=6)		Average (N=18)	
	F*	%**	F	%	F	%	F	%
309 Length of a performance	2	33%	2	33%	2	33%	6	33%
310 Use of scenary	6	100%	4	67%	5	83%	15	83%
311 Use of costumes	2	33%	3	50%	3	50%	8	44%
312 Use of props	4	67%	1	17%	2	33%	7	39%
313 Attempt at special effects	3	50%	3	50%	5	83%	8	61%
314 Staging of scenes	5	83%	1	17%	6	100%	12	67%
315 Name of another Elizabethan theater	3	50%	0	0%	5	83%	8	44%
316 Name of another Elizabethan dramatist	1	17%	0	0%	2	33%	3	17%
317 Name of another Elizabethan drama-tists'work	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	1	6%

*Frequency of occurrence of an item

**Percentage of occurrence of an item

TABLE 6

(CONTINUED)

THEATER IN SHAKESPEARE'S TIME CONTENT OF THE SHAKESPEARE UNIT FOR GRADES NINE, TEN, AND TWELVE ON PART II OF THE WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE UNIT CONTENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT

Item	Frequency of and Percentage of Series in Which Item Occurred							
	Grade Nine (N=6)		Grade Ten (N=6)		Grade Twelve (N=6)		Average (N=18)	
	F*	%**	F	%	F	%	F	%
318 Career of an actor in the Globe Theater	5	83%	6	100%	3	50%	14	78%
319 Reason for closing theater during the London Plague	0	0%	1	17%	3	50%	4	22%
320 Destruction of Globe Theater	0	0%	2	33%	2	33%	4	22%
321 Shakespeare's treatment of women in dramas	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	1	6%

*Frequency of occurrence of an item

**Percentage of occurrence of an item

low and that elaborate costumes were used. Less than 50 percent of the time textbooks reported that the theaters were closed during the London plague years and that there were other theaters besides the Globe and other dramatists besides Shakespeare writing in London during this time period. Information that the Globe Theater was destroyed by fire and about how women were portrayed as characters in the dramas was not included in any units in any grades.

Content Related to Instruction

Table 7 presents the content of the Shakespeare Unit for grades nine, ten, and twelve related to instruction. There were twenty-six items on the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument pertaining to content related to instruction.

An analysis of the content related to instruction suggested that students at all three grade levels be taught the Shakespeare unit in basically the same manner. Students should be given the value of studying Shakespeare; the influence of William Shakespeare in contemporary theater, film, music or art; and the opinions of literary critics about William Shakespeare's plays. These items should be taught by reading the unit in class, by answering questions, writing papers, and doing projects about the play.

Less than 50 percent of the time were the names of contemporary Shakespeare acting companies given or

TABLE 7

CONTENT RELATED TO INSTRUCTION OF THE SHAKESPEARE UNIT FOR GRADES NINE, TEN, AND TWELVE ON PART II OF THE WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE UNIT CONTENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT

Item	Frequency of and Percentage of Series in Which Item Occurred							
	Grade Nine (N=6)		Grade Ten (N=6)		Grade Twelve (N=6)		Average (N=18)	
	F*	%**	F	%	F	%	F	%
401 Value of studying Shakespeare	1	17%	5	83%	5	83%	11	61%
402 Shakespeare and his influence in contemporary literature	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%	1	6%
403 Shakespeare and his influence in contemporary theater, film, music or art	6	100%	4	67%	4	67%	14	78%
404 Contemporary Shakespeare acting companies	2	33%	2	33%	0	0%	4	22%
405 Shakespearean acting as a career for students	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
406 Female actors in contemporary Shakespearen performance	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

*Frequency of occurrence of an item

**Percentage of occurrence of an item

TABLE 7

(CONTINUED)

CONTENT RELATED TO INSTRUCTION OF THE SHAKESPEARE UNIT FOR GRADES NINE, TEN, AND TWELVE ON PART II OF THE WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE UNIT CONTENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT

Item	Frequency of and Percentage of Series in Which Item Occurred							
	Grade Nine (N=6)		Grade Ten (N=6)		Grade Twelve (N=6)		Average (N=18)	
	F*	%**	F	%	F	%	F	%
407 Minority actors in comtemporary Shakespearen performance	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
408 Shakespeare's works in contemporary English speaking countries	0	0%	2	33%	0	0%	2	11%
409 Shakespeare's work in contemporary non-English speaking countries	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	3	17%
410 Description of Folger Shakespeare Library	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
411 Use of specific literary critics opinions about the play	2	33%	5	83%	6	100%	13	72%

*Frequency of occurrence of an item

**Percentage of occurrence of an item

TABLE 7

(CONTINUED)

CONTENT RELATED TO INSTRUCTION OF THE SHAKESPEARE UNIT FOR GRADES NINE, TEN, AND TWELVE ON PART II OF THE WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE UNIT CONTENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT

Item	Frequency of and Percentage of Series in Which Item Occurred							
	Grade Nine (N=6)		Grade Ten (N=6)		Grade Twelve (N=6)		Average (N=18)	
	F*	%**	F	%	F	%	F	%
412 Suggested length of time to study Shakespeare unit	2	33%	2	33%	1	17%	5	28%
413 Timetable for studying Shakespeare unit	0	0%	2	33%	0	0%	2	11%
414 Homework assignments for the unit	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%
415 Questions measuring student progress through the unit	6	100%	6	100%	6	100%	18	100%
416 Topics of writing assignments	6	100%	6	100%	6	100%	18	100%
417 Suggested passages from the play for memory work by students	1	17%	2	33%	2	33%	5	28%

*Frequency of occurrence of an item

**Percentage of occurrence of an item

TABLE 7

(CONTINUED)

CONTENT RELATED TO INSTRUCTION OF THE SHAKESPEARE UNIT FOR GRADES NINE, TEN, AND TWELVE ON PART II OF THE WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE UNIT CONTENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT

Item	Frequency of and Percentage of Series in Which Item Occurred							
	Grade Nine (N=6)		Grade Ten (N=6)		Grade Twelve (N=6)		Average (N=18)	
	F*	%**	F	%	F	%	F	%
418 Evaluating memory work	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
419 Assigning parts in the play to students for classroom dramatization	4	67%	2	33%	2	33%	8	44%
420 Suggested scenes from the play for dramatization	2	33%	1	17%	1	17%	4	22%
421 Suggested projects related to the unit	6	100%	3	50%	4	67%	13	72%
422 Evaluation of projects related to the unit	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
423 Methods of comprehending the plot of the play	5	83%	5	83%	5	83%	15	83%

*Frequency of occurrence of an item

**Percentage of occurrence of an item

TABLE 7

(CONTINUED)

CONTENT RELATED TO INSTRUCTION OF THE SHAKESPEARE UNIT FOR GRADES NINE, TEN, AND TWELVE ON PART II OF THE WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE UNIT CONTENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT

Item	Frequency of and Percentage of Series in Which Item Occurred							
	Grade Nine (N=6)		Grade Ten (N=6)		Grade Twelve (N=6)		Average (N=18)	
	F*	%**	F	%	F	%	F	%
424 Understanding Shakespearean language	6	100%	6	100%	6	100%	18	100%
425 Literature terms unique to the unit	6	100%	5	83%	3	50%	14	78%
426 Criteria for overall evaluation of the unit	4	67%	5	83%	6	100%	15	83%

*Frequency of occurrence of an item

**Percentage of occurrence of an item

information about Shakespearean acting as a career presented at all grades. The Folger Shakespeare Library's name was included in the Shakespeare units, yet information about the library itself and its purpose and/or functions was not included.

Content about Shakespeare's popularity as a dramatist was included, but how Shakespeare's dramas were produced in non-English speaking countries was not. Further, minority actors were not mentioned in any series.

Summary of Research Question 1

To summarize the data in Tables 4-7, Table 8 is included. Table 8 presents the numbers and percentages of items in each category on the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument covered by at least half of the six literature textbook series in the sample for each grade level. Table 8 also reports the percentages of the content areas of the Shakespeare unit where content items occurred in all three grade levels. For the total sample of eighteen literature textbook series, 81 percent of the items on the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument were covered. Of this figure of 81 percent, 26 percent of the items were repeated in the literature textbook series in grades nine, ten, and twelve. Dividing 26 percent into the percentages of average total coverage in grade nine (33 percent), grade ten (46 percent) and grade twelve (54 percent) showed that 79 percent of the material

TABLE 8

FREQUENCES AND PERCENTAGES OF LITERATURE TEXTBOOK SERIES IN WHICH ITEMS ON PART II OF THE WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE UNIT CONTENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT OCCURRED 3 TIMES OR 50 PERCENT FOR EACH GRADE

	Biographical Information (N=28)		Shakespeare's Works (N=24)		Shakespeare's Theater (N=21)		Issues Related to Instruction (N=27)		Average Total Coverage (N=100)	
	F*	%**	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Number of items covered Grade 9	9	32%	2	8%	12	57%	10	37%	33	33%
Number of items covered Grade 10	17	61%	7	29%	11	52%	11	41%	46	46%
Number of items covered Grade 12	17	61%	14	58%	12	57%	11	41%	54	54%
Items covered all three grades	8	42%	2	14%	7	33%	9	33%	26	26%
Total separate items	27	96%	19	79%	21	100%	14	52%	81	81%

*Frequency of occurrence of an item

**Percentage of occurrence of an item

in the unit was repeated in grade nine, 57 percent in grade ten, and 49 percent in grade 12.

Research Question 2

Is there evidence that the content of the William Shakespeare Unit in grades nine, ten, and twelve differs among the grades and among the literature textbook series in the sample?

Chi-Square Tables Discussed

A 3 x 4 chi-square table was computed to answer research question 2. This 3 x 4 chi-square table was computed to support or to reject the hypothesis implicit in research question 2 that no significant difference existed in the content of the Shakespeare units for grades nine, ten, and twelve across all textbooks in the sample. A level of significance of less than .05 was established to support or to reject this implied hypothesis.

The 3 x 4 chi-square table used to answer research question 2 is presented in Table 9. The three rows represent the three grade levels of textbooks in the sample. The four columns represent the four content areas: biographical information, Shakespeare's works, Shakespeare's theater, and instructional issues on the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument. The cells represent frequency counts or the occurrence of each type of item at each grade level. This 3 x 4 chi square

TABLE 9

CHI-SQUARE TABLE OF TEXTBOOK ANALYSIS UNITS (TAU'S) BY CONTENT AREA ON THE WSCAI* AND BY GRADE (N = 1616)

		CONTENT AREA				
GRADE LEVEL		BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION	SHAKESPEARE'S WORKS	SHAKESPEARE'S THEATER	INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES	TOTAL
9	a.	64	30	108	356	558
	b.	3.96	1.86	6.68	22.03	34.53
	c.	11.47	5.38	19.35	63.80	
	d.	23.70	15.31	34.73	42.43	
10		90	60	86	275	511
		5.57	3.71	5.32	17.02	31.62
		17.61	11.74	16.83	53.82	
		33.33	30.61	27.65	32.78	
11		116	106	117	208	547
		7.18	6.56	7.24	12.87	33.85
		21.21	19.38	21.39	38.03	
		42.96	54.08	37.62	24.79	
TOTAL		270	196	311	839	1616
		16.71	12.13	19.25	51.92	100.00

Statistics for 2-Way Tables

Chi-Square 99.503 DF = 6 PROB = 0.0001

a. Frequency
b. Percentage of total
c. Percentage of row
d. Percentage of column

*William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument

table had a total frequency count of 1616 TAU's separated into 558 TAU's for grade nine, 511 TAU's for grade ten, and 547 TAU's for grade twelve. These frequencies represented percentages of 34.5 percent, 31.6 percent and 33.9 percent for each grade level.

The chi-square analysis shows the distribution of types of content to be different among the three grade levels. The difference in the content of the Shakespeare unit for grades nine, ten, and twelve shown in Table 9 represents the emphasis placed on each of the four types of items that were used to define content on the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument at each of these levels.

At the ninth grade level, a greater percentage of emphasis was placed on issues related to instruction. The observed frequencies 63.8 percent were greater than the total percentage of the estimated frequencies for the column of 51.9 percent. Less emphasis was placed on biographical content as seen in the 11.5 percent observed percentage as compared to 16.7 percent as the estimated percentage for the column. The emphasis placed in grade nine on Shakespeare's theater was about the same at 19.4 percent for the observed frequency percentage as compared to the column estimated percentage of 19.3 percent.

Few departures were noted from the overall pattern in the emphasis of content in the grade ten Shakespeare unit.

When the observed percentages of content emphasis for the four categories for grade ten were compared with estimated content percentages, similarities were noted in biographical percentages of 17.6 percent observed percentages compared to 16.7 estimated; percentage of instructional issues percentages of 53.8 percent were observed compared to 51.9 percent estimated; Shakespeare's theater percentages of 16.8 percent observed compared to 19.3 percent estimated, and Shakespeare's works percentage of 11.7 percent observed compared to 12.1 estimated.

At the twelfth grade level, three substantial differences were noted in the emphasis among the different types of content. The observed percentages of biographical items increased from 16.7 estimated to 21.2 percent observed. Under instructional items, the estimated percentage of 51.9 percent decreased to an observed 38 percent. Under the category of Shakespeare's theater, the estimated percentage of 19.3 percent increased to a 21.4 observed percentage, and under Shakespeare's works the observed percentage increased from 12.1 estimated percentage to a 19.4 percent observed percentage.

Comparing the observed percentages of occurrence of content items at the grades nine, ten, and twelve, the occurrence of items devoted to biographical information increased from 11.5 percent in grade nine to 17.6 percent for grade ten, and increased to 21.2 percent for grade

twelve. In items related to instruction, the observed frequency percentages decreased from 63.8 percent in grade nine to 53.8 percent for grade ten and to 38.0 percent for grade twelve. Items dealing with Shakespeare's theater remained approximately the same with the observed column percentages for grade nine at 19.4 percent, grade ten at 16.8 percent and grade twelve at 21.4 percent. Observed percentages of items dealing with Shakespeare's work increased from 5.4 percent in grade nine to 11.7 percent grade ten and 19.4 percent grade twelve.

The chi-square in Table 9 was subdivided into three 4 x 6 chi-square tables for grade nine, ten, and twelve by item and by series to see if a difference existed in the Shakespeare units among the six literature textbook series at each of the grade levels in the sample. This additional subdivision provided another basis for answering research question 2, as well as for drawing conclusions from these data in Chapter V. Each series, when examined at each grade level, reflected a percentage of emphasis on each of the four categories of Part II of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument. These percentages of emphasis are reported in Tables 10, 11, and 12.

In Table 10 the estimated percentage of emphasis for the total TAU's for grade nine showed that 11.5 percent of the Shakespeare unit contained biographical information, 63.8 percent of the unit contained issues related to

TABLE 10

CHI-SQUARE TABLE OF TEXTBOOK ANALYSIS UNITS (TAU) FOR GRADE NINE BY ITEM AND BY SERIES (N = 558)

SERIES		ITEMS: BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION	SHAKESPEARE'S WORKS	SHAKESPEARE'S THEATER	INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES	TOTAL
1	a.	10	4	28	70	112
	b.	1.79	0.72	5.02	12.54	20.17
	c.	8.93	3.57	25.00	62.50	
	d.	15.63	13.33	25.93	19.66	
2		15	11	25	53	104
		5.57	3.71	5.32	17.02	18.64
		14.42	10.58	24.04	50.96	
		23.44	36.67	23.15	14.78	
3		12	4	17	76	109
		2.15	0.72	3.05	13.62	19.53
		11.01	3.67	15.60	69.72	
		18.75	13.33	15.74	21.35	
4		6	3	11	31	51
		1.08	0.54	1.97	5.56	9.14
		11.76	5.88	21.57	60.78	
		9.38	10.00	10.19	8.71	
5		20	6	20	76	122
		3.58	1.08	3.58	13.62	21.82
		16.39	4.92	16.39	62.30	
		31.25	20.00	18.52	21.35	
6		1	2	7	50	60
		0.18	0.36	1.25	8.96	10.75
		1.67	3.33	11.67	83.33	
		1.56	6.67	6.48	14.04	
TOTAL		64	30	108	356	558
		11.47	5.38	19.35	63.80	100.00

Statistics for 2-Way Tables

Chi-Square 29.443 DF = 15 PROB = 0.0141

a. frequency b. percentage total c. percentage of row
d. percentage of column

instruction, 19.4 percent of the unit contained information about Shakespeare's theater, and 5.4 percent of the unit contained information about Shakespeare's work. Using these estimated percentages, and comparing them to the observed percentages of each of the six literature textbook series, conclusions about the percentage of emphasis in each series can be made. Series 1 emphasized the biographical information (8.9 percent), issues related to instruction (62.5 percent) and Shakespeare's work (3.6 percent). Series 1 differed in the emphasis it placed on content about Shakespeare's theater (25 percent). Series 2 emphasized biographical information at the same observed percentage of emphasis as the estimated percentage of emphasis for all the TAU's in grade nine except, in instructional issues, Shakespeare's theater and Shakespeare's work a wider range existed. Series 3 was similar in biographical content (11 percent) and Shakespeare's works (3.7 percent) between the observed percentages and the estimated percentages of the total TAU's for grade nine. Series 3 differed in grade nine on issues related to instruction at 69.7 percent and Shakespeare's theater 15.6 percent. Series 4 compared with all four content areas of the estimated percentages of the total TAU's with the observed percentages of the total TAU's for grade nine: biographical content 11.8 percent; instructional issues 60.8 percent; Shakespeare's theater 21.6 percent and Shakespeare's works

5.9 percent. Series 5 was similar to the estimated percentages for grade nine total TAU's in instructional issues 62.3 percent; Shakespeare's theater, 16.4 percent; and Shakespeare's work 4.9 percent. Series 5 differed from the estimated percentage of biographical information with 16.4 percent. Series 6 differed in all four categories with the estimated percentages for the total TAU's for grade nine: biographical information 1.7 percent; issues related to instruction at 83.3 percent; Shakespeare's theater at 11.7 percent; and Shakespeare's work at 3.3 percent.

In Table 11 the estimated percentages of emphasis for the total TAU's for grade ten showed that 17.6 percent of the Shakespeare unit contained biographical information, 53.8 percent contained issues related to instruction, 16.8 percent of the unit contained information about Shakespeare's theater, and 11.7 percent of the unit contained information about Shakespeare's works. Series 1 percentages differed with these estimated percentages in biographical content at 14.2 percent, instructional issues at 64.6 percent and Shakespeare's theater at 9.7 percent. Series 1 was similar to the estimated percentages of 11.74 compared with the observed percentage of 11.5. Series 2 differed in three of the four content areas with the estimated percentages for the total TAU's for grade ten. It differed in issues related to instruction at 42.5 percent, Shakespeare's theater at 20.4 percent, and

TABLE 11

CHI-SQUARE TABLE OF TEXTBOOK ANALYSIS UNITS (TAU) FOR GRADE TEN BY ITEM AND BY SERIES (N = 511)

		ITEMS				
SERIES		BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION	SHAKESPEARE'S WORKS	SHAKESPEARE'S THEATER	INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES	TOTAL
1	a.	16	13	28	73	113
	b.	3.13	2.54	5.02	14.29	22.11
	c.	14.16	11.50	25.00	64.60	
	d.	19.78	21.67	25.93	26.55	
2		21	21	23	48	113
		4.11	4.11	4.50	9.39	22.11
		18.58	18.58	20.35	42.48	
		23.33	35.00	26.74	17.45	
3		10	10	15	55	90
		1.96	1.96	2.94	10.76	17.61
		11.11	11.11	16.67	61.11	
		11.11	16.67	17.44	20.00	
4		24	7	13	26	70
		4.70	1.37	2.54	5.09	13.70
		34.29	10.00	18.57	37.14	
		26.67	11.67	15.12	9.45	
5		13	5	15	24	57
		2.54	0.98	2.94	4.70	11.15
		22.81	8.77	26.32	42.11	
		14.44	8.33	17.44	8.73	
6		6	4	9	49	68
		1.17	0.78	1.76	9.59	13.31
		8.82	5.88	13.24	72.06	
		6.67	6.67	10.47	17.82	
TOTAL		90	60	86	275	511
		17.61	11.74	16.83	53.82	100.00

Statistics for 2-Way Tables

Chi-Square 48.246 DF = 15 PROB = 0.0001

a. frequency b. percentage total c. percentage of row
d. percentage of column

Shakespeare's works at 18.6 percent. The similarity between Series 2 and the estimated percentage was in biographical information at 18.6 percent percent. Series 3 differed in two of the four content areas: biographical information of 11.1 percent; and instructional issues at 61.1 percent. Series 3 was similar in Shakespeare's theater 16.7 percent and Shakespeare's work 11.1 percent. Series 4 was similar in two areas, Shakespeare's theater at 18.6 percent and Shakespeare's works 10 percent, but Series 4 was different in biographical information at 34.3 percent and in instructional issues 37.1 percent. Series 5 and Series 6 differed in all four content areas. Series 5 differed in biographical content 22.8 percent; instructional issues at 42.1 percent; Shakespeare's theater at 26.3 percent; and Shakespeare's work at 8.8 percent. Series 6 differed in biographical information 8.8 percent; instructional issues 72.1 percent; Shakespeare's theater 13.2 percent; and Shakespeare's works 5.9 percent.

In Table 12, the estimated percentages of emphasis for the total TAU's for grade twelve showed that 21.2 percent of the Shakespeare unit contained biographical information, 38.0 percent of the unit contained issues related to instruction, 21.4 percent of the unit contained information about Shakespeare's theater, and 19.4 percent of the unit contained information about Shakespeare's works, Series 1 was similar to these estimated percentages in three of the

TABLE 12

CHI-SQUARE TABLE OF TEXTBOOK ANALYSIS UNITS (TAU) FOR GRADE TWELVE BY ITEM AND BY SERIES (N = 547)

		ITEMS				
SERIES		BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION	SHAKESPEARE'S WORKS	SHAKESPEARE'S THEATER	INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES	TOTAL
1	a.	19	7	17	33	76
	b.	3.47	1.28	3.11	6.03	13.89
	c.	25.00	9.21	22.37	43.42	
	d.	16.38	6.60	14.53	15.87	
2		18	15	16	26	75
		3.29	2.74	2.93	4.75	13.71
		24.00	20.00	21.33	34.67	
		15.52	14.15	13.68	12.50	
3		17	23	19	39	98
		3.11	4.20	3.47	7.13	17.92
		17.35	23.47	19.39	39.80	
		14.66	21.70	16.24	18.75	
4		25	19	27	35	106
		4.57	3.47	4.94	6.40	19.38
		23.58	17.92	25.47	33.02	
		21.55	17.92	23.08	16.83	
5		20	36	28	34	118
		3.66	6.58	5.12	6.22	21.57
		16.95	30.51	23.73	28.81	
		17.24	33.96	23.93	16.35	
6		17	6	10	41	74
		3.11	1.10	1.83	7.50	13.53
		22.97	8.11	13.51	55.41	
		14.66	5.66	8.55	19.71	
TOTAL		116	106	117	208	547
		21.21	19.38	21.39	38.03	100.00

Statistics for 2-Way Tables

Chi-Square 33.893 DF = 15 PROB = 0.0035

a. frequency b. percentage total c. percentage of row
d. percentage of column

four content areas: biographical information 25 percent; issues related to instruction 43.4 percent; and Shakespeare's theater at 22.4 percent. Series 1 differed in information about Shakespeare's works 9.21 percent. Series 2, 3, and 4 were similar in observed percentages of all content areas with the estimated percentages for the total TAU's for grade twelve. Series 2 was similar in biographical information at 24 percent; issues related to instruction at 34.7 percent; Shakespeare's theater at 21.3 percent; and Shakespeare's work 20 percent. Series 3 was similar in biographical information at 17.4 percent; instructional issues 39.8 percent; Shakespeare's theater 19.4 percent; and Shakespeare's work 23.5 percent. Series 4 was similar in biographical information 23.6 percent; instructional issues 33.0 percent; Shakespeare's theater 25.5 percent; and Shakespeare's work 17.9 percent. Series 5 was similar in two of the four content areas biographical information at 17 percent; and Shakespeare's theater 23.7 percent. Differences existed in Series 5 in instructional issues 28.8 percent and Shakespeare's works 30.5 percent. Series 6 differed in three of the four content areas: instructional issues 55.4 percent; Shakespeare's theater 13.5 percent; and Shakespeare's work at 8.1 percent. Series 6 was similar in biographical information 23 percent.

Discussion of Research Question 2

The statistics for all the chi-squares showed that a

difference does exist among the content of the William Shakespeare units for grades nine, ten, and twelve. The level of significance that the computer generated for all these chi-square was less than .0001 for Table 9, .0141 for Table 10, .0001 for Table 11 and .0035 for Table 12. These levels of probability were lower than the .05 level set to reject the hypothesis implicit in research question 2, stating that no significant difference existed in the content of the William Shakespeare unit in the sample of six literature textbook series student editions and teacher manuals for grades nine, ten, and twelve.

The results of the chi-square test showed that a significant difference did exist in the Shakespeare unit for grades nine, ten, and twelve, and among series within grade nine, ten, and twelve. Differences also existed in the area of biographical information where the observed percentages increased from grade nine to grade twelve. This increase also occurred for material relating to Shakespeare's works and Shakespeare's theater. Further, emphasis on instructional items decreased from grade nine to grade twelve.

Chapter Summary

This chapter began with a restatement of the two research questions presented in Chapter I and the methodology used to answer each question. A discussion of the data followed.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter V is divided into two major sections: conclusions based on the data analysis, and recommendations for literature textbook practices and for further research based on the conclusions.

Conclusions

Based on the data analysis and the review of the literature, two conclusions were drawn in this study. First, the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument provided a description of the content of the William Shakespeare unit for grades nine, ten, and twelve in a sample of six literature textbook series. Second, the William Shakespeare units at these three grade levels and for all literature textbook series in the sample were more similar than they were different.

Conclusion One

First, based on Table an analysis of Tables 3-8 in Chapter 4, the content of the Shakespeare unit in all literature textbook series in the sample, was described by the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument. That content consisted of a varying emphasis on biographical information, Shakespeare's theater, Shakespeare's

works, and issues related to instruction.

The William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument did not include "characterization" as an item even though this aspect of content related to instructional issues appeared 100 percent of the time in the sample. In a revision of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument, based on the data collection, this item should be added to issues related to instruction. Also recommended is a classification system to weight the relative importance or unimportance of instrument items.

Conclusion Two

The second research question asked whether a difference existed between the Shakespeare units for grades nine, ten, and twelve. The chi-square tests revealed significant differences less than the .05 level of significance established to reject the hypothesis implicit in this study that no significant differences existed in the literature textbook series across grades nine, ten, and twelve. These significant differences, when compared with the frequency counts and percentages of frequencies were statistically significant but not substantially significant because close examination of the William Shakespeare Unit in the literature textbook series shows that similarities in format and content of the units were apparent. In Text Materials in Modern Education Lee J. Cronbach outlined four principles that should control the selective organiza-

tion of subject matter into a textbook (Cronbach, 1955). These four principles and supporting data from the study are used as a framework to discuss conclusion two.

First, materials must hang together in some way when they are organized in a textbook. This is coherence, and it is usually achieved in terms of an organized discipline. In this study, coherence was achieved by the organized discipline of the instructional unit that included the recurring author, William Shakespeare. Coherence of a different type, that relating to format, was found in data that Shakespeare instructional units for grades nine, ten, and twelve had the same average number of pages in the student edition (minus the actual text of the play), and in the teacher edition for all series. The placement of explanatory information was basically the same. The unit included bibliographic and audio-visual information. All units in all grade level textbooks in the sample included tragedies as the representative drama.

Second, Cronbach wrote that not all the information in any one discipline can be presented in the text. Therefore, the publisher should seek to incorporate the essentials; that is to define basic concepts, statements, principles and explain and illustrate their application. Currently, publishers accomplish this by surveying the educational market to see if the content of the Shakespeare unit met the educational objectives of the school systems

who would potentially be adopting their respective literature textbook series (De Silva, 1986). In this study, the content of the William Shakespeare unit as measured by the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument was an indicator of what information should or should not be included in a literature textbook series Shakespeare unit (Walker & Soltis, 1986) because 81 items on the instrument appeared 50 percent of the time or more. No series at any grade level contained all 81 items, however.

Third, Cronbach stated that the text is usually written for immature learners. Therefore, the discipline must be simplified to whatever degree fits the intended learner, and it is understood that texts written for more advanced learners will present the same discipline with more precision later. Data in this study showed that 81 items on the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument were covered a minimum of 50 percent of the time in the literature textbook series used in the sample. However, of these 81 items, 26 percent of them were repeated in the literature textbook series in grades nine, ten, and twelve. Dividing 26 percent into the percentage of average total coverage in grades nine, ten, and twelve showed that 79 percent of the material in the unit was repeated in grade nine, 57 percent in grade ten, and 49 percent in grade 12. These figures supported Andrew C. Porter's research stating that at any grade level,

different textbooks in a series share in common about 50 percent of the content covered (Cody, 1986).

A closer examination of the data collected to describe the four areas of Shakespeare unit content as measured on the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument lent support to notion that Shakespeare units in the sample did not handle the same discipline with more precision but tended to increase content by repeating facts across grade levels. This also supports the notion of mentioning cited by Durkin (Cody, 1986). To illustrate, the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument results showed that biographical information was basically factual information about Shakespeare's life. Information that could illuminate a student's understanding of such issues as his birth and death were not included.

Looking more closely at other areas of the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument, literature textbook content on Shakespeare's works were presented as lists of titles of comedies, tragedies, histories and romances. Students were seldom presented with publication information such as quarto editions and folio editions. In fact, the Second, Third and Fourth Folio were not mentioned.

Information about Shakespeare's theater had the highest percentages of occurrence of the four major content areas analyzed. Yet, students were not offered the oppor-

tunity to learn about the destruction of the Globe Theater, Shakespeare's treatment of women in the dramas or names of other Elizabethan theaters or other Elizabethan dramatists.

Issues relating to instruction involved reading the play in class, as well as exercises and projects designed to help students understand the plot, the language, and the characters. Evaluation of the Shakespeare unit was based on short quizzes, objective tests, and suggestions of topics for essays. All these activities were cited by Veidemanis (1964) as contributing to negative student attitudes toward the study of Shakespeare. Items on the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument, that would appeal to the diversity of the high school student population (Apple, 1986), were not included such as mentioning minority actors, acting as a career and evidence of Shakespearean performances in non-English speaking countries.

Fourth, the text is organized typically as a course of study so that its chapters are studied in sequence according to Cronbach. The definition of sequencing in this study was limited to the amount of and distribution of the content of the Shakespeare unit. Items on the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument that could be used to support a notion of sequencing, such as suggestions for length of time spent on the unit (number of weeks) and

timetables for studing the unit (daily lesson plans), were absent.

Recommendations

Based on the two conclusions of this study, recommendations for literature textbook publications and for further research were made in the following areas: recurring authors, teaching Shakespeare, and literature textbooks evaluation criteria.

Recurring Authors

More research in the concept of recurring authors should be done to determine who these authors are and what of their works are included in literature textbook series at various grade levels. Data could be collected by a content analysis of the table of contents of a representative sample of literature textbook series student editions or teacher manuals for grades seven through twelve. After such a listing of recurring authors is identified, a body of case study research could be developed to determine what content is taught about recurring authors and how this content is taught to students. The information about recurring authors has implications for literature textbook series content revisions of student editions and teacher manuals. In addition, developing a body of research on scholarship and methodology for teaching specific recurring authors has implications for continuing education and for staff

development programs for English educators. Seminars for this purpose could involve literature scholars, classroom teachers, representatives of the literature textbook divisions of literature textbook publishers, and textbook critics.

Teaching Shakespeare

Research in teaching Shakespeare is sparse. One historical study, three descriptive studies, and two experimental studies have been completed over a period of forty-five years based on the review of the literature in this study. More experimental research is needed to measure the effect of using different teaching methods to approach the study of Shakespeare such as listening to complete productions of the dramas or attending Shakespearean productions to improve comprehension and student attitudes toward Shakespeare. Results of this experimental research can be used to restructure literature textbook series. Variables to be considered in possible experimental studies about instructional methodology are the learner's age, gender, race, learning style, academic ability level and preconceived attitudes toward studying Shakespeare. Teacher variables to consider are amount of teacher training in teaching Shakespeare and teacher attitudes toward teaching Shakespeare.

Further exploratory research needs to be done on curriculum revision of Shakespeare unit content to upgrade

Shakespeare units in light of contemporary research in teaching. The first step would be to take the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument and survey English teachers to see how the instrument items could be weighted based on their relative importance or unimportance in actual classroom practice. Once these data are compiled, questions related to curriculum revision can be posed. Questions related to curriculum revision in teaching Shakespeare might include: How many units in the total literature curriculum for a public school system should be devoted to studying Shakespeare? At what age should students begin studying Shakespeare? Should the content of the Shakespeare unit be sequenced? What criteria should be used to develop this sequence? Should the Shakespeare curriculum be limited to studying tragedies? What comedies, histories, or romances might be included in a Shakespeare unit? In what order should these different types of plays be taught?

Literature Textbook Evaluation Criteria

Educators involved in literature textbook selection should be required to evaluate literature textbook student editions and teacher manuals for all grades in a given literature series in light of data in this study concerning William Shakespeare as a recurring author. This data showed that the content of units containing Shakespeare were substantially repeated. This evaluation could be done

using some type of rating instrument that includes issues related to sequencing of instructional content because data in this study showed that the sequencing pattern existing in the Shakespeare units in the sample was merely a mentioning of more facts at the different grade levels. When textbook evaluators are aware of this repetition, they will have more information to make textbook adoption decisions that meet the needs of their school systems.

Finally, more research in literature textbook evaluation and selection should also include continued development of the Textbook Analysis Unit (TAU) as a vehicle for evaluating the content of literature textbook student editions and teacher manuals. Following the body of research on textbook content, the concept of Textbook Analysis Units (TAU's) also might be applied to measuring content "overload" (too much content in a textbook passage) and content "underload" (too little content in a textbook passage). Currently, readability formulas used in measuring textbook content do not appear to measure these two concepts so application of the Textbook Analysis Unit (TAU) to the whole issue of readability requires further investigation.

Closing Statement

A content analysis is rarely ever finished. It will answer some questions; it will pose new questions (Krippindorf, 1980). This study was a case study through content analysis of the concept of the recurring author,

William Shakespeare, as a methodology for describing the content of the William Shakespeare unit in a sample of literature textbook series. The study also attempted to determine if units at different grade levels in a literature textbook series were different.

This study was significant because it appeared to be the first systematic investigation in teaching Shakespeare based on literature textbook series content. While the content of the Shakespeare units differed statistically but not substantially across grade levels in the sample, the study's results validated the need for further study in recurring authors, particularly to find out if other recurring authors are treated differently or essentially the same as William Shakespeare was treated in content of currently used literature textbook series. Another consideration should be the determination of what content about Shakespeare is really important to know. Also, the study provided a basis for making suggestions for literature curriculum revision and literature textbook revision that would be responsive to a need for sequencing in treating content about recurring authors. In light of a current interest in cultural literacy this type of research seems basic. Finally, the future need for developing literature textbook evaluation instruments to measure content about recurring authors as well as the need to determine whether content about recurring authors should be sequenced in any

manner was also highlighted as a result of data analysis.

Research on literature, specificially in teaching Shakespeare, can begin if recommendations from this study about recurring authors in textbook content, teaching Shakespeare methodology, and textbook evaluation criteria are incorporated into such endeavors as curriculum planning, literature textbook publication and actual classroom practice. Otherwise, educators may continue to encourage publishers of the 1990's to publish the Shakespeare unit in literature textbook series for grades nine, ten, and twelve in much the same manner as that suggested by William Rolfe in 1869, and, in fact, would this be so wrong?

APPENDIX A

Student Enrollment for Grades Nine, Ten, and Twelve of the Member States of the National Association of State Textbook Administrators

State	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 12	Total
1. Alabama	58,628	52,759	43,490	154,877
2. Arizona	No statewide textbook adoption for grades 9, 10, or 12			
3. Arkansas	35,410	33,081	27,302	95,793
4. California	No statewide textbook adoption for grades 9, 10, or 12			
5. Florida	145,470	136,424	89,663	371,557
6. Georgia	94,291	86,787	65,528	246,606
7. Idaho	15,540	15,540	15,540	46,620
8. Illinois	133,306	135,447	123,049	391,802
9. Kentucky	51,188	49,605	41,586	142,379
10. Louisiana	64,888	55,665	41,489	162,042
11. Mississippi	38,370	35,224	30,281	103,875
12. Nevada	12,112	12,508	11,604	36,224
13. New Mexico	21,818	20,032	16,946	58,796
14. North Carolina	100,000	100,000	85,000	285,000
15. Oklahoma	43,738	43,659	40,552	127,949
16. Oregon	34,338	34,569	33,495	102,402
17. South Carolina	54,128	47,603	38,539	140,270
18. Tennessee	75,000	70,000	65,000	210,000
19. Texas	264,318	228,112	182,731	675,161
20. Utah	28,117	26,792	25,076	79,985
21. Virginia	79,436	73,845	69,385	222,666
22. West Virginia	27,177	26,128	23,344	76,649
TOTALS	1,377,273	1,283,780	1,069,600	3,730,653

APPENDIX B

VITA

Robert L. Harrison, Jr. is an English teacher at Bluefield High School in Bluefield, West Virginia.

Bob Harrison earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Education with a specialization in the public school curriculum for grades 1-12 from Bluefield State College in Bluefield, West Virginia in 1968. He earned a Master's degree in secondary education and journalism from Kent State University in Kent, Ohio in 1972. In 1975, he earned a Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Educational Administration. And, he earned a Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Administration in 1988 from The American University in Washington, D.C., where he was a Bishop John Fletcher Hurst Fellowship recipient for 1987 and 1988.

In 1985 he participated in the Folger Shakespeare Library's Teaching Shakespeare Institute sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities. He participated in "Leo Tolstoy's War and Peace as the Universal Novel" seminar at The Ohio State University in 1986, also sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities. He developed Bluefield High School Regional Fine Arts Program named a Center of Excellence by the National Council of Teachers of English in 1985.

APPENDIX C

William Shakespeare Unit

Content Analysis Instrument

I. General Information about the Shakespeare Unit.

Textbook series name: _____

Publisher: _____

Copyright Date: _____

Assigned Code: _____

Grade Level: _____

Number of pages in the unit (Student Edition) _____

Number of pages in the unit (Teacher Manual) _____

Title of the drama: _____

Type of drama: _____

Abridgement of the drama mentioned: _____

Format of the unit: _____

Number of illustrations in the unit: _____

List of bibliographic resources: _____

List of audio-visual resources: _____

II. Content of the Shakespeare Unit

A. Biographical Content

____ 101 Place of birth

____ 102 Date of birth

____ 103 Baptismal date

____ 104 Father's name

____ 105 Mother's name

____ 106 The Shakespeare coat of arms

____ 107 Shakespeare's formal education

____ 108 Shakespeare's marriage date

____ 109 Age at marriage

____ 110 Wife's name

____ 111 Wife's age at marriage

____ 112 First child's name

____ 113 First child's date of birth

____ 114 Birth of twins

____ 115 Twin's names

____ 116 Twin's date of birth

____ 117 1585-1592, "Dark Years" or "Lost Years"

____ 118 Shakespeare's membership in Chamberlain's Men Theatrical Company

____ 119 Shakespeare's membership in King's Men Theatrical Company

____ 120 Explanation of a theatrical company

____ 121 Shakespeare's financial success in the theater

____ 122 Retirement to Statford-upon-Avon

____ 123 Retirement year

____ 124 Date of Death

____ 125 Age at Death

____ 126 Shakespeare's Will

____ 127 Place of burial

____ 128 Tombstone inscription

B. Shakespeare's Works

____ 201 Shakespeare as dramatist

____ 202 Shakespeare as narrative poet

____ 203 "Venus and Adonis"

____ 204 "The Rape of Lucrece"

____ 205 Sonnets

____ 206 Source materials for plays

____ 207 Number of Shakespeare's plays

____ 208 Definition of Quarto edition

____ 209 Publication of Quarto editions

____ 210 Definition of Folio edition

____ 211 Explanation of First Folio

____ 212 John Heminge and Henry Condell, compilers of First Folio

____ 213 Publication date of the First Folio

____ 214 Second Folio

____ 215 Third Folio

____ 216 Fourth Folio

____ 217 Shakespearean comedies

____ 218 Title of one comedy

____ 219 Shakespearean tragedies

____ 220 Title of one tragedy

____ 221 Shakespearean history plays

____ 222 Title of one history play

____ 223 Shakespearean romances

____ 224 Title of one romance

C. Theater in Shakespeare's Time

____ 301 Plays produced during the Elizabethan Age

____ 302 Plays produced during the Renaissance

____ 303 Audience description

____ 304 Cost of admission to a play

____ 305 Groundling defined

____ 306 Globe Theater

____ 307 Parts of the Globe Theater described or illustrated

____ 308 Time of day of plays

____ 309 Length of a performance

____ 310 Use of scenery

____ 311 Use of costumes

____ 312 Use of props

____ 313 Attempt at special effects

____ 314 Staging of scenes

____ 315 Name of another Elizabethan Theater

____ 316 Name of another Elizabethan dramatist

____ 317 Name of another Elizabethan dramatist's work

____ 318 Career of an actor in the Globe Theater

____ 319 Reason for closing theaters during the London Plague

____ 320 Destruction of Globe Theater

____ 321 Shakespeare's treatment of women in the dramas

D. Content Related to Instruction

____ 401 Value of studying Shakespeare

____ 402 Shakespeare and his influence in contemporary literature

____ 403 Shakespeare and his influence in contemporary theater, film, music, or art

____ 404 Contemporary Shakespearean acting companies

____ 405 Shakespearean acting as a career for students

____ 406 Female actors in contemporary Shakespearean performance

____ 407 Minority actors in contemporary Shakespearean performance

____ 408 Shakespeare's works in contemporary English speaking countries

____ 409 Shakespeare's works in contemporary non-English speaking countries

____ 410 Description of Folger Shakespeare Library

____ 411 Use of specific literary critics' opinions about the play

____ 412 Suggested length of time to study Shakespeare unit

____ 413 Timetable for studying Shakespeare unit

____ 414 Homework assignments for the unit

____ 415 Questions measuring student progress through the unit

____ 416 Topics for writing assignments

____ 417 Suggested passages from the play for memory work by students

____ 418 Evaluating memory work

____ 419 Assigning parts in the play to students for classroom dramatization

____ 420 Suggested scenes from the play for dramatization

____ 421 Suggested projects related to the unit

____ 422 Evaluation of projects related to the unit

____ 423 Methods for comprehending the plot of the play

____ 424 Understanding Shakespearean language

____ 425 Literature terms unique to the unit

____ 426 Criteria for overall evaluation of the unit

E Additional Information

____ 500 Item not included on William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument

APPENDIX D

Textbook Analysis Unit (TAU) Coding Sheet

Textbook Series: _____

Textbook Series Code: _____

Grade Level: _____

Coder's Name: _____

Total Textbook Analysis Units: _____

Instructions: Code each Textbook Analysis Unit (TAU) marked in each literature textbook series student edition and teacher manual with the number from the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument that best describes the Textbook Analysis Unit (TAU).

TAU					
1. ____	13. ____	25. ____	37. ____	49. ____	61. ____
2. ____	14. ____	26. ____	38. ____	50. ____	62. ____
3. ____	15. ____	27. ____	39. ____	51. ____	63. ____
4. ____	16. ____	28. ____	40. ____	52. ____	64. ____
5. ____	17. ____	29. ____	41. ____	53. ____	65. ____
6. ____	18. ____	30. ____	42. ____	54. ____	66. ____
7. ____	19. ____	31. ____	43. ____	55. ____	67. ____
8. ____	20. ____	32. ____	44. ____	56. ____	68. ____
9. ____	21. ____	33. ____	45. ____	57. ____	69. ____
10. ____	22. ____	34. ____	46. ____	58. ____	70. ____
11. ____	23. ____	35. ____	47. ____	59. ____	71. ____
12. ____	24. ____	36. ____	48. ____	60. ____	72. ____

73. ____	99. ____	125. ___	151. ___	177. ___	203. ___
74. ____	100. ___	126. ___	152. ___	178. ___	204. ___
75. ____	101. ___	127. ___	153. ___	179. ___	205. ___
76. ____	102. ___	128. ___	154. ___	180. ___	206. ___
77. ____	103. ___	129. ___	155. ___	181. ___	207. ___
78. ____	104. ___	130. ___	156. ___	182. ___	208. ___
79. ____	105. ___	131. ___	157. ___	183. ___	209. ___
80. ____	106. ___	132. ___	158. ___	184. ___	210. ___
81. ____	107. ___	133. ___	159. ___	185. ___	211. ___
82. ____	108. ___	134. ___	160. ___	186. ___	212. ___
83. ____	109. ___	135. ___	161. ___	187. ___	213. ___
84. ____	110. ___	136. ___	162. ___	188. ___	214. ___
85. ____	111. ___	137. ___	163. ___	189. ___	215. ___
86. ____	112. ___	138. ___	164. ___	190. ___	216. ___
87. ____	113. ___	139. ___	165. ___	191. ___	217. ___
88. ____	114. ___	140. ___	166. ___	192. ___	218. ___
89. ____	115. ___	141. ___	167. ___	193. ___	219. ___
90. ____	116. ___	142. ___	168. ___	194. ___	220. ___
91. ____	117. ___	143. ___	169. ___	195. ___	221. ___
92. ____	118. ___	144. ___	170. ___	196. ___	222. ___
93. ____	119. ___	145. ___	171. ___	197. ___	223. ___
94. ____	120. ___	146. ___	172. ___	198. ___	224. ___
95. ____	121. ___	147. ___	173. ___	199. ___	225. ___
96. ____	122. ___	148. ___	174. ___	200. ___	226. ___
97. ____	123. ___	149. ___	175. ___	201. ___	227. ___
98. ____	124. ___	150. ___	176. ___	202. ___	228. ___

APPENDIX E

Marking and Coding Textbook Analysis Units (TAU'S)
Using a Researcher Written Textbook Passage
For a Student Edition of a Literature
Textbook Series Shakespeare Unit

Marking Textbook Analysis Units (TAU's)

William Shakespeare wrote during the Elizabethan Age of English literature.[1]/ A baptismal record shows William was baptized on April 26, 1564.[2]/ It was the custom of the time period to baptize a child three days after the child's birthday. In Shakespeare's case this would mean he was born on April 23, 1564.[3]/ His father was John Shakespeare[4]/ and his mother was Mary Arden Shakespeare.[5]/ His formal education was a grammar school education.[6]/

He is credited with writing thirty-seven plays[7]/, two poems "Venus and Adonis"[8]/ and "The Rape of Lucrece,"[9]/ and 154 sonnets.[10]/

Coding Textbook Analysis Units (TAU's)

Textbook Series: Harrison Textbook Sample

Textbook Series Code: Series 40

Grade Level: 10

Coder's Name: Bob Harrison

Total Textbook Analysis Units: 10

Instructions: Code each Textbook Analysis Unit (TAU) marked in each literature textbook series student edition and teacher manual with the number from the William Shakespeare Unit Content Analysis Instrument that best describes the Textbook Analysis Unit (TAU).

TAU

1. 301
2. 103
3. 102
4. 104
5. 105
6. 107
7. 207
8. 203
9. 204
10. 105

APPENDIX F

Textbook Analysis Units (TAU) Coded and Percentage of Agreement Scores of the Two Textbook Coders

Grade 9

Series	Number of TAU's	Percentage of Agreement
01	112	91.07%
02	104	93.27%
03	109	91.74%
04	51	94.11%
05	122	92.62%
06	60	90.00%
Total	558	Average 92.14%

Grade 10

Series	Number of TAU's	Percentage of Agreement
01	113	94.69%
02	113	92.04%
03	90	94.44%
04	70	91.43%
05	57	91.23%
06	68	94.12%
Total	511	Average 92.99%

Grade 12

Series	Number of TAU's	Percentage of Agreement
01	76	93.42%
02	75	90.66%
03	98	93.87%
04	106	91.51%
05	118	90.76%
06	74	93.24%
Total	547	Average 92.24%

Textbook Analysis Units (TAU) Coded and Percentage of Agreement Scores - (continued)

Combined Grades 9, 10, 12

Series	Number of TAU's	Percentage of Agreement
01	301	93.06%
02	292	91.99%
03	297	93.35%
04	227	91.56%
05	297	91.53%
06	202	92.45%
Total	1616	Average 92.32%

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Richard C., Robert Osborn and J. Tierney. Learning to Read in American Schools. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1984.

Apple, Michael W. Teachers and Texts. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul Inc., 1986.

Applebee, Arthur. Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1974.

Bennett, William J. To Reclaim a Legacy. Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1984.

Berelson, Bernard. Content Analysis in Communication Research. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1952.

Bernstein, Harriet. "The New Politics of Textbook Adoption". Phi Delta Kappan. March, 1985, 463-465.

Birx, Charles Robert. "Concepts of Death Presented in Contemporary Realistic Children's Literature: A Content Analysis." Ed.D. diss., Northern Arizona University, 1979.

Black, Hillel. The American Schoolbook. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1967.

Bloom, Allan. The Closing of the American Mind. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987.

Bohn, Harold C. "Toward an Improved Teaching of Shakespeare in the Secondary School. Proposals Based on Experiences with Graduates in New Jersey High Schools at the New Jersey State Teacher's College, Montclair 1944-1951." Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1955.

Borg, Walter and Meredith D. Gall. Educational Research, An Introduction. New York: Longman, 1983.

Brandt, Ronald S. Content of the Curriculum. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1988.

Brichto, Mira. "Shakespearean Drama as it is Taught and Learned in Three Urban Secondary Schools." Ph.D. diss. University of Cinncinati, 1977.

Budd, Richard W., Robert K. Thorp, and Lewis Donohew. Content Analysis of Communications. New York: MacMillon Co., 1967.

Burress, Lee and Edward Jenkinson. The Student's Right to Know. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1982.

Burton, Dwight L. Literature Study in the High Schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Chall, Jeanne S. An Analysis of Textbooks in Relation to Declining SAT Scores. Princeton, New Jersey: College Entrance Exam Board, 1977.

Charles, James P. "A Content Analysis of American Indian Literature as Presented in North Carolina High School Literature Textbooks." Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina, 1986.

Chute, Marchette. An Introduction to Shakespeare. New York: Scholastic Books, 1979.

Cody, Caroline. A Policymaker's Guide to Textbook Selection. Alexandria, Virginia: National Association of State Boards of Education, 1986.

Cole, John. Reading in America, 1978. Washington, D.C.: The Library of Congress, 1979.

_____. The Textbook in American Society. Washington, D.C.: The Library of Congress, 1981.

Committee on Bias and Censorship. Censorship: Don't Let It Become an Issue in Your School. Urbana, Illinois: The National Council of Teachers of English, 1978.

Committee on the Right to Read. The Student's Right to Read. Urbana, Illinois: The National Council of Teachers of English, 1977.

The Council Staff. Guidelines for Selecting Bias Free Textbooks and Storybooks. New York: The Council on Interracial Books for Children, 1979.

The Council Staff. "Process in Texas Far Right Works to Turn Back the Clock," Interracial Books for Children Bulletin. Vol. 14, No. 5, 1980, 17-21.

Craik, George L. The English of Shakespeare; Illustrated in a Philogical Commentary on His Juluis Caesar. Ed. W.J. Rolfe from 3rd rev. London ed. (1864). Boston: Ginn, 1869.

Cronbach, Lee J. Text Materials in Modern Education. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1955.

Cullum, Albert. Shake Hands With Shakespeare. New York: Scholastic Books, 1968.

Davis, Bob. "Scholastic Work," The Wall Street Journal. January 3, 1985, 1.

Davis, James E. Teaching Shakespeare. Athens, Ohio: Southeast Ohio Council of Teachers of English, 1976.

Davis, James E. Dealing with Censorship. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1979.

Dawson, Giles E. The Life of Shakespeare. Washington, D.C.: Folger Books, 1958.

DeSilva, Bruce. Schoolbooks: A Question of Quality. Reprint of a special four part series. The Hartford Courant, June 15-18, 1986.

Duke, Charles R. "A Look at Current Satewide Textbook Adoption Procedures". Capstone Journal of Education. Spring, 1987, 11-25.

Each, Maurice J. Developing an Instrument for Assessing Instructional Materials. Toronot: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1972.

Edens, Walter, Christopher Durer, Walter Eggers, Duncan Harris, and Keith Hull. Teaching Shakespeare. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1977.

Edwards, Alexander. "A Study of Teaching the Significance in Literature." Ed.D. diss., State University of New York at Albany, 1984.

Evans, Bertrand. Teaching Shakespeare in the High School. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.

Everitt, B.S. The Analysis of Contingency Tables. London: Chapman and Hall, 1977.

Farr, Roger. "Do Adoption Committees Perpetuate Mediocre Textbooks." Phi Delta Kappan. March 1985, 467-471.

Ferry, Margaret G. "Eva March Tappan (1854 - 1930): Bringing English Literature to the Public Schools." Ph.D. diss., Arizona State University, 1985.

Fiske, Edward. "Are They Dumbing Down the Textbooks," Principal. November 1984, 44-46.

Fox, David J. The Research Process in Education. New York: Holt Rhinehart and Winston, 1969.

Frey, Charles. "Teaching Shakespeare in America," Shakespeare Quarterly, 1984, 35(5).

Gardner, Charles T. "Legal Aspects of Textbook Selection as Related to Public Schools." Ed.D. diss., University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1978.

Gigante, Mary. "The Use of Questions by Teachers of Literature." Ed.D. diss., Florida Atlantic University, 1981.

Gokhale, D. V. and Solomon Kullback. The Information in Contingency Tables. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc., 1978.

Goldstein, Paul. Changing the American Schoolbook. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1978.

Good, Carter V. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1973.

Goodlad, John I. A Place Called School. New York: McGraw Hill, 1984.

Graham, George. "A Present and Historical Analysis of Basal Reading Series." Ed.D. diss., University of Virginia, 1978.

Hanson, E. Mark. Educational Administration and Organizational Behavior. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1985.

Harrison, George B. The Teaching of Shakespeare. Lincoln: Cliff's Notes Inc., 1963.

Hart, Bernard Thomas. "A Content Analysis of Secondary English Instructional Materials in Literature Produced by Project English Centers." Ed.D. diss., University of Rochester, 1979.

Heath, Harris. "Teaching Minority Literature: A Study of Minority Literature Content in the American Literature Course in the Secondary Schools of South Carolina 1973-1974." Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1974.

Hefley, James C. Textbooks on Trial. Wheaton, Illinois: Victor Books, 1977.

Heilman, Robert B. "Shakespeare in the Classroom" in Teaching Shakespeare, ed. Waltern Edens. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press 1977.

Hillocks, George. Alternatives in English. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1974.

Hirsch, E.D. Cultural Literacy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1987.

Holsti, Ole R. Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1969.

Hudson, Henry N. Shakespeare as a Textbook. Boston: Ginn, Heath and Co., 1870.

_____. The School Shakespeare. Boston: Ginn, Heath and Co., 1870.

_____. Essays on Education, English Studies, and Shakespeare. Boston: Ginn, Heath and Co., 1882.

Instruction and Professional Development Committee. "Selected Guidelines for the Selection of Textbooks and Other Instructional Materials." Information N.E.A. Washington, D.C.: The National Education Association, 1981.

Irmscher, William F. Teaching Expository Writing. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.

Jaffe, A.J. and Herbert F. Spirer. Misused Statistics: Straight Talk for Twisted Numbers. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc., 1987.

Johnson, Allan G. Social Statistics Without Tears. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1977.

Johnson, Frances Holman. "Critical Requirements for English Literature Courses." Ed.D. diss., Northeast Louisiana University, 1980.

Kaiser, Marjorie. "Work Content and Attitudes Toward Work in Eighth-Grade Literature Anthologies." Ed.D. diss., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1976.

Karolides, Nicholas and Lee Burress. Celebrating Censored Books. Urbana, Illinois: The National Council of Teachers of English, 1985.

Kelly, Patricia P. and Robert C. Small. Censorship or Selection. Blacksburg, Virginia: Virginia Association of Teachers of English, 1986.

Keith, Sherry. Politics of Textbook Selection. Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, Project Report No. 81-A7, April 1981.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Korin, Basil P. Statistical Concepts for the Social Sciences. Cambridge, Massachesetts: Winthrop Publishers, Inc., 1975.

Krippendorff, Klaus. Content Analysis, An Introduction to Its Methodology. Beverly Hills, California, Sage Publications, 1980.

Lade, John Karl. "Textbook Publishing in Public Education." Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1977.

Lade, Linda (Andes). "Textbook Revisions in Public Education." Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1977.

Lang, Lynn Z. "The Relationships Among Alternative Measures of Reading Comprehension in Learning Disabled Students." Ed.D. diss., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1983.

Last, Ellen L. "Textbook Selection or Censorship: An Analysis the Complaints Filed in Relation to Three Major Literature Series Proposed for Adoption in Texas in 1978." Ph.D. diss., University of Texas at Austin, 1984.

Lewis, Rodgers. "Better Safe Than Speedy." American School Board Journal. September 1984, 42-43.

Marder, Louis. His Exists and Entrances: The Story of Shakespeare's Reputation. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott and Co., 1963.

Marker, Mary Z. "The Value of Actors in the Classroom," Shakespeare Quarterly, 1984 35(5).

Marshall, John Daniel. The Politics of Curriculum Manifested Through the Selection and Adoption of Textbooks for Texas." Ph.D. diss., University of Texas at Austin, 1985.

Martin, Nancy, D'Arcy, Pat, Newton, Bryan, and Parker, Robert. Writing and Learning Across the Curriculum 11-16. Upper Montclair, New Jersey: Boynton/Cook Publishers, 1976.

McLean, Andrew. Shakespeare: An Annotated Bibliography and Media Guide for Teachers. Urbana, Illinois: The National Council of Teachers of English, 1980.

Merzano, Robert J., Ronald S. Brandt, Carol Sue Hughes, Beau Fly Jones, Barbara Z. Presseisen, Stuart C. Rankin and Charles Suhor. Dimensions of Thinking: A Framework for Curriculum and Instruction. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1988.

Mizener, Arthur. Teaching Shakespeare. New York: New American Library, 1969.

Monseau, Virginia. "Young Adult Literature and Reader Response: A Descriptive Study." Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1986.

Muther, Connie. "Textbook Deals: Is Your Board Putting Cost Before Curriculum." American School Board Journal. January 1985, 34.

McManaway, James G. and Jeanne Addison Roberts. A Selective Bibliography of Shakespeare. Washington D.C.: The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1975.

National Association of State Boards of Education. Textbook Reform: A Cooperative Agenda. Minutes of a meeting on June 21 and 22, 1985 in Washington, D.C.

National Council of Teachers of English. Shakespeare in Schools and Colleges. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964.

National Council of Teachers of English. "Guidelies for Nonsexist Use of Language in NCTE Publications." Policy Statement, National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana, Illinois, 1976.

National Council of Teachers of English. "Censorship and Professional Guidelines." Policy Statement, National Council of Teachers of English. Urbana, Illinois, 1982.

National Council of Teachers of English. "Essentials of English." Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1982.

National Education Association. Resolutions, Legislative Program, and New Business 1977-88. Washington, D.C.: The National Education Association, 1987.

Newlin, Louisa. "Shakespeare Saved from Drowning," Shakespeare Quarterly, 1984 35(5).

Newby, James. "Equality of Educational Opportunity: A Content Analysis of Six Selected Negro Authors, 1960-1970." Ed.D. diss., University of Southern California, 1974.

Niles, Carl Edgar. "A Study of Factors Influencing Student Attitude Toward the Study of Shakespearean Drama." Ed.D. diss., University of Tennessee, 1970.

Nilsen, Allen. Sexism and Language. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1977.

O'Donnell, Roy C. "Needed Research in the Teaching of English" in Education in the 80's: English, ed R. Blaird Shuman. Washington, D.C.: The National Education Association, 1981.

Oliphant, Patricia. "Textbook Selection Practices and Procedures." Ph.D. diss. University of Maryland, 1987.

Ornstein, Robert. Shakespeare in the Classroom. Urbana: Illinois: Educational Illustrators, 1960.

Ott, Lymon. An Introduction to Statistical Methods and Data Analysis. Boston: P.W.S. Publishers, 1984.

Porreca-Easley, Zana. "The Relationship Between Teaching Shakespearean Drama Using Media and Student Retention and Appreciation." Ph.D. diss., University of Arizona, 1987.

Powell, Arthur G., Eleanor Farrar, and David K. Cohen. The Shopping Mall High School Boston Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin, 1985.

Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, Third Edition, American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., 1983.

Purves, Alan C. and Richard Beach. Literature and the Reader. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1972.

Racism and Sexism Resource Center for Educators. Stereotypes, Distortions and Omissions in U.S. History Textbooks. New York: Council on Interracial Books for Children, 1978.

Ravitch, Diane. The Schools We Deserve. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1985.

Ravitch, Dianne and Chester E. Finn. What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know? New York: Harper and Row, 1987.

Roberts, Katherine. "The New Battleground: Religion in School Textbooks." The New York Times. March 8, 1987, E-24.

Roden, Sally. "A Comparison of Three Techniques of Teaching Literature: Silent Reading, Reader's Theater and Video Taped Readers Theater." Ed.D. diss., North Texas State University, 1978.

Rosengren, Karl E. Advances in Content Analysis. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1981.

Runyon, Richard P. and Audrey Haber. Fundamentals of Behavioral Statistics. New York: Random House, 1984.

Sadker, Myra and David Sadker. Beyond Pictures and Pronouns: Sexism in Teacher Education Textbooks. Washington, D.C.: Women's Educational Equity Program, U.S. Department of HEalth, Education and Welfare, 1977.

Salomone, Ronald E. Teaching Shakespeare II. Athens, Ohio: Southeast Ohio Council of Teachers of English, 1985.

Sander, Gerald. A Shakespeare Primer. New York: Holt Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1970.

Santora, Ronald A. "The Response to Literature: A New Curriculum." Ph.D. diss., Michigan State University, 1972.

Schoenbaum, S. Shakespeare: The Globe and the World, New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Sax, Gilbert. Foundations of Educational Research. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1979.

Selden, Ramsay W. "Sentence Structure and Readability: The Influence of Frequency Based Expectancies of Syntactic Structure on the Comprehensibility of Text." Ph.D. diss., University of Virginia, 1977.

Sellar, Walter Carruthers and Robert Julian Yeatmen. 1066 and All That, a Memorable History of England Comprising All the Parts You Can Remember Including One Hundred and Three Good Things, Five Bad Kings, and Two Genuine Dates. New York: E.P. Dutton and Company, 1931.

Sexism in Textbooks Committee of Women. Guidelines for Improving the Image of Women in Textbooks. Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman, 1975.

Shanker, Albert. "Who Should Evaluate the Textbooks?," The New York Times. July 8, 1984, 37.

Shugert, Diane P. Rationales for Commonly Challenged Taught Textbooks. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1983.

Simon, Henry W. Reading Shakespeare in American Schools and Colleges. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1932.

Slayton, Paul C. "The Teaching of Shakespeare's JULIUS CAESAR in Interlinear Translation at the Secondary School Level." Ed.D. diss., University of Virginia, 1969.

Strunk, William Jr., and E.B. White. The Elements of Style. 3d. ed. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1979.

Tanner, Daniel and Laurel N. Tanner. Curriculum Development. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1980.

Task Force on Racism and Bias in the Teaching of English. Non-White Minorities in English and Language Arts Materials. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1978.

Tate, Gary, and P.J. Corbett. The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Tate, Merle W. Statistics in Education and Psychology. New York: Macmillan, 1965.

Thompson, Patricia. "The Textbook's Niche in the Ecology of Education: The Cronbach Study After 25 Years." Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1982.

Tipton, Renee. "The Effects of Dramatic Activities on Secondary School Students' Learning Retention and Attitude." Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1984.

Traversi, D.A. An Approach to Shakespeare. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1969.

Turabian, Kate L. A Manual for Writers. 5d. ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Turse, Paul. "Shakespeare Kabuki Style." Ed.D. diss., Columbia University, 1971.

Tyler, Ralph W. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

Tyson-Bernstein, Harriet. A Conspiracy of Good Intentions, America's Textbook Fiasco. Washington, D.C.: The Council for Basic Education, 1988.

Veidemanis, Gladys. "Shakespeare in the High School Classroom," English Journal, LII (April, 1964), 240-247.

United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization. Glossary of Educational Terms. Paris: United Nation's Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1984.

_____. "Do Textbooks Foster Secular Humanism," The New York Times. October 19, 1986, E-6.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Fair Textbooks: A Resource Guide. Washington, D.C.: Clearinghouse Publication 61, May 1979.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Characters in Textbooks. Washington, D.C.: Clearinghouse Publications 62, May 1980.

Walker, Decker and Jonas F. Soltis. Curriculum and Aims. New York: Teacher's College Press, 1986.

Walker, Harriet T. "Goals for Teaching Literature to College Bound Students: An Investigation of Priorities as Perceived by High School Teachers, College Professors, and College Students." Ph.D. diss., University of Idaho, 1982.

Walker, Myrtle L. "The Portrayl of Blacks, Mexican Americans and Indians in Selected Texas Adopted Secondary American Literature Textbooks." Ed.D. diss., East Texas State University, 1982.

Webster, Margaret. Shakespeare Without Tears. New York: Fawcett World Library, 1966.

Wenger, Denise A. "A Study of Language Arts Textbook Selection Instruments." Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1986.

Wolfe, Denny. Guidelines for Preparation of Teachers of English Language Arts. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1986.

Wright, Louis B. and Le Mar, Virginia A. The Folger Guide to Shakespeare. New York: Pocket Books, 1969.